

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

MEETING OF THE  
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

CALTRANS DISTRICT 7 OFFICE  
CONFERENCE ROOM 1.040A  
100 NORTH MAIN STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2009

9:00 A.M.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

A P P E A R A N C E S

Committee Members

Hamid Bahadori, Chairman

John Fisher, Vice Chairman

Jacob Babico

Wayne Henley

Jeff Knowles

Farhad Mansourian

Robert Maynard

Deborah Wong

Caltrans Personnel

Devinder Singh, Committee Secretary

Robert Copp

Dave Gamboa

Robert McLaughlin

Joseph Rouse

Also Present

Matthew Schmitz  
Federal Highway Administration

Robert Shanteau, PhD  
California Association of Bicycling Organizations

Chad Dornsife  
Best Highway Safety Practices Institute

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

A P P E A R A N C E S

Also Present (Continued)

Marty Amundson  
Los Angeles County, Department of Public Works

Bill Shao  
City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation

Jim Baross  
California Bicycle Advisory Committee and  
League of American Bicyclists

Chief Jim Hudson  
California Police Chiefs Association

Jim Lissner  
Resident of Hermosa Beach

David Roseman  
City of Long Beach

Kang Hu  
City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation

Kevin Schumacher  
California Public Utilities Commission, Rail Crossing  
Section

Laura Wells  
City of San Jose

Ted Lengel, Retired Engineering Assistant  
City of Pomona, Transportation and Development Department

Damien Arrula  
City of Claremont  
Also representing the Cities of San Dimas and La Verne

Deputy Joseph Key  
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

## I N D E X

	Page
Organization Items	
1. Introductions/Announcements	1
2. Approval of Minutes	4
3. Membership	5
4. Public Comments	5
Agenda Items	
5. Public Hearing	
07-17      Proposal for C17A (CA) ROAD WORK Plaque and Amendment to CA MUTCD Section 6F.104	6
08-8      Bicycle and Motorcycle Detection at New or Upgraded Signalized Intersections (Required due to AB 1581)	7
09-5      Amendment to CA MUTCD Sections 2B.03 Size of Regulatory Signs and 2C.04 Size of Warning Signs (Request Submitted by Caltrans)	118
09-6      Amendment to CA MUTCD Section 2D.45 General Service Signs (D9 Series) (Request Submitted by Caltrans)	123
6. Request for Experimentation	
09-9      Request to Experiment with Steady Red Stop Line Light (Requested by the City of Los Angeles)	126
09-13     Experiment Request for the USAGE of "HOV" IN LIEU OF "CARPOOL" Signage Related to the Los Angeles EXPRESS LANES	145
09-14     Experiment Request for the Usage of "TRANSIT LANE" in lieu of "CARPOOL" Signage	167
Lunch Recess	171

## I N D E X

	Page
7. Discussion Items	
09-15 Non-standard Traffic Control devices on Public Roadways	172
09-16 Signage, Intersection Design and the 3.0 Second Minimum Yellow for Turning Movements Monitored by Red Light Cameras	204
09-10 Section 2B.13 Speed Limit Sign (R2-1) of CA MUTCD (Request Submitted by Caltrans)	103
8. Information Items	
09-17 California MUTCD Revision to include National MUTCD 2003 Revision No. 2 Maintaining Traffic Sign Retroreflectivity	223
09-18 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Project Funding Sign Assembly	229
9. Recent Actions Taken by Caltrans on the Committee's Recommendations	
05-10 Proposal for the Watershed Boundary Signs	--
06-12 No Parking Signs	--
10. Tabled Items	
08-22 Proposal to amend CA MUTCD Section 10C.15 and 10C.23 (Item Deferred for Future Meeting)	--
06-7 MUTCD 2003 Revision No. 1 (Pharmacy Signing) Proposed to Adopt Pharmacy Signing in California	--
08-18 Proposal to adopt "NO IDLING COMMERCIAL VEHICLES & SCHOOL BUSES" (Item deferred for Future Meeting)	--
11. Next Meeting	232
12. Adjournment	232
Certificate of Reporter	233

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 9:08 a.m.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Folks, if I can have  
4 your attention we are going to call the meeting to order.  
5 The folks in the back. Thank you very much.

6 Good morning everyone. I am going to call the  
7 meeting of May 14 of the California Traffic Control Devices  
8 Committee to order. Thank you all for being here.

9 We will start with the introductions and as our  
10 norm is we will start with the Committee Members. Ms. Wong.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Deborah Wong with AAA of  
12 Northern California.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Good morning. I'm  
14 Farhad Mansourian. I am Marin County Public Works Director  
15 and I am one of the two representatives for counties in  
16 California.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Good morning. I  
18 am John Fisher with the City of Los Angeles Department of  
19 Transportation. Welcome to our site. And I represent the  
20 League of California Cities for the southern half of the  
21 state.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I'm Hamid Bahadori  
23 with the Automobile Club of Southern California.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'm Wayne Henley with  
25 Caltrans Traffic Operations.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Robert Maynard with the  
2 California Highway Patrol.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Jeff Knowles, the  
4 traffic engineer for the City of Vacaville and representing  
5 the California League of Cities Northern Section.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. And we start  
7 with the members of the public. If you please introduce  
8 yourselves and the agency you represent. And more  
9 importantly for time management, let me know which item you  
10 are interested in. If you are just listening we are glad to  
11 have you. But if you have a specific item please let me  
12 know. We'll start with Bob.

13 (Thereupon, all those in the attendance  
14 identified themselves.)

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We have a member of  
16 the Committee who joined us later, Mr. Babico.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yes, my name is Jacob  
18 Babico, I work for the County of San Bernardino in the  
19 Department of Public Works. I represent the California  
20 State Association of Counties, representing Southern  
21 California.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Before  
23 we go into the approval of minutes a couple of quick  
24 announcements. First, we have two new members that have  
25 joined us recently. One has been an alternate with us for

1     awhile. Jeff Knowles is replacing our old friend, Ed von  
2     Borstel, representing the Northern California Cities.  
3     Appointed by the League replacing Ed and we welcome him.  
4     And Chief Robert Maynard from the CHP. Welcome to both of  
5     you as the new voting members. And Jeff has been with us  
6     for awhile.

7             Another thing that I heard. I have mixed feelings  
8     about this. I'm kind of happy but I'm kind of sad to see  
9     him go. I have heard that our friend from FHWA is moving up  
10    to maybe better things and he may not be coming to the  
11    committee meetings and he will be training one of his staff  
12    to replace him. Matt, get up here. We are not going to let  
13    you, we are not going to let you leave that --

14            Matthew Schmitz is with the Federal Highway  
15    Administration. He has been -- all kidding aside, he has  
16    been a real great friend of the Devices Committee, has been  
17    a great asset. And I have been told that he is moving on  
18    and we may not have the benefit of his wisdom and advise and  
19    torture. So Matt, do you want to say a few words?

20            MR. SCHMITZ: Unexpectedly I guess on the fly I  
21    would say thanks for the kind words. Yes, I myself found  
22    out just roughly a month ago that after 12 years, sometimes  
23    painful but hopefully productive most of the time.

24            I have seen some tremendous changes. A few of the  
25    faces have been around longer than I have and I think they



1 would agree there has been a tremendous shift as California  
2 has moved away from the Traffic Manual, adopting the  
3 National Manual along with its own differences and  
4 enhancements in the supplement. And eventually the  
5 California MUTCD that we have today is probably the more  
6 rewarding effort I have been associated with in my 20 years.  
7 So it's certainly mixed for me to be moving to a different  
8 position.

9 But Steve Pyburn will be the person. He is new to  
10 our agency but he comes as a consultant and he has got some  
11 experience with the MUTCD. You will probably meet him at  
12 the next meeting wherever that is. And you might get stuck  
13 with me. It would be nice to kind of have a real transition  
14 where he and I are together at least for the one meeting,  
15 make some introductions and give him my take about what the  
16 Federal Highway role is and what it is not, especially  
17 during these meetings.

18 So I appreciate the acknowledgement. I just, I  
19 didn't expect it would work out quite like this. I thought  
20 it would be a longer phase-out and it's not going to work  
21 out that way. So welcome to the new faces, you're in for  
22 some fun. Thank you.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you, Matt.

24 Okay, with that moving on, Approval of Minutes,  
25 Item number 2. Members, have you had a chance to look at

1 the minutes? Any corrections, changes, amendments or any  
2 motion for approval?

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Move approval.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I have a motion. Is  
5 there a second?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes. The microphone?

7 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, they are just recording  
8 microphones, they don't amplify. They are just for  
9 recording, just for recording. I need you to be in front of  
10 it so I can hear you.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Speak loud.

12 THE REPORTER: Yes.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Second.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, I have a  
15 motion and a second. Discussion?

16 Seeing none, all in favor say aye.

17 (Ayes.)

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

19 Passes.

20 Number 3, Membership. Do any of the members have  
21 any off-agenda items that they wish to share with the rest  
22 of the Committee?

23 No. Moving on to 4, Public Comments. At this  
24 time members of the public may comment on any item not  
25 appearing on the agenda. If you have any issues that you

1 want to discuss with the Committee, understanding that the  
2 Committee cannot take any decision on that issue but this is  
3 the opportunity. If you are here for any item that is on  
4 the agenda please wait until that item come up. Any members  
5 of the public that has any issues to share?

6 No? Seeing none we move on. Well, this is going  
7 to be a short meeting.

8 We go to Public Hearing. Okay, I'm going to --  
9 When we get to discussion items I will play around with the  
10 order a little bit, colleagues, because of the number of the  
11 people that are here for the item 09-10. But for Public  
12 Hearing we just follow the agenda. Let's go with the Item  
13 07-17, Proposal for Road Work Plaque. Mr. Henley.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. We are asking to  
15 defer that until the next meeting because we need to get  
16 some feedback from our construction division and we haven't  
17 gotten that yet.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, the item is  
19 delayed for the next meeting.

20 We go to the next item, it's coming back to us,  
21 it's Item 08-8, bicycle and motorcycle detection. This is  
22 follow-up to Assembly Bill 1581 that was passed requiring  
23 bicycle detection at traffic signals, new and modifications.  
24 Subject to Caltrans approval, adoption and approval of the  
25 standards. So who will be representing -- who will be

1 presenting this, Mr. Henley?

2 MR. GAMBOA: Today I will be representing the  
3 Subcommittee Chair, which was Ahmad Rastegarpour. He had a  
4 family emergency so I have been asked to pinch hit for him  
5 today. I have a technical assistant, Bob Shanteau, who will  
6 chime in when there's some questions from the Committee.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. And by  
8 the way, colleagues. I know that you introduced yourselves.  
9 But when you get up to the podium please reintroduce  
10 yourself because they are keeping the minutes and we need to  
11 know who is speaking.

12 MR. GAMBOA: Sorry. My name is Dave Gamboa from  
13 Caltrans headquarters, signal operations. And I am here  
14 today to talk about AB 1581.

15 And going over the minutes from the last meeting.  
16 The Committee asked if the subcommittee could address some  
17 of these issues before we come to this meeting. And they  
18 asked to tighten up the language on the document, which was  
19 done. I think everybody has hopefully had a chance to read  
20 the agenda item. So that was done. The subcommittee  
21 members worked on that.

22 Also they were asked to come up with bicycle  
23 timing. There was some question about the minimum eight  
24 second green time for the bicycle time, the start-up time.  
25 But there was a form that was developed by the subcommittee

1 and that was also in the agenda item.

2 What it describes is a basic six second start-up  
3 time plus the width of the intersection divided by the  
4 start-up time of the bicycle, which is considered 10 miles  
5 an hour at 15 feet per second. And that would be the  
6 minimum green time to get a bicycle through the  
7 intersection. So that language is listed in the --

8 DR. SHANTEAU: Green plus yellow plus red.

9 MR. GAMBOA: Excuse me?

10 DR. SHANTEAU: Green plus yellow plus red.

11 MR. GAMBOA: Must be greater than the minimum  
12 green --

13 DR. SHANTEAU: Plus yellow plus red.

14 MR. GAMBOA: -- plus red. So that language is now  
15 part of the new bicycle timing.

16 Also, this is where we are going to use this  
17 bicycle timing. And we also plan to have a path study. We  
18 will start July 1, 2009 to make sure we are covering all  
19 the, all the items regarding the bicycle timing.

20 Also there was also a bicycle/ped push button,  
21 well actually it was a bicycle push button, in instances  
22 where we had the need for supplemental detection.

23 Those items were all touched on the agenda.

24 Anyway, are there any questions?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, members, we

1 have been through this a few times and we asked it to go  
2 back to the Bicycle Advisory Committee, which it did. And I  
3 was present in one of the Bicycle Advisory Committees that  
4 this was discussed. I participated in another one I think,  
5 conference call.

6 So let me ask you this. The Bicycle Advisory  
7 Committee, Caltrans Bicycle Advisory Committee, they are all  
8 okay with what you are presenting?

9 MR. GAMBOA: Yes they are.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

11 MR. GAMBOA: They are okay with that. So the next  
12 thing is will the Committee, are they good with this.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, now we get  
14 into that. Okay colleagues, any questions for the speaker?  
15 I am going to start here. Let's go to Mr. Fisher.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: There were a  
17 number of technical issues that were brought to my  
18 attention, probably five of them, so I'd like to go over  
19 there.

20 MR. GAMBOA: Sure.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But I don't want  
22 to dominate the discussion on it. So if there are other  
23 ones along the way then I'll go back to some of the other  
24 ones.

25 My first one would be on page 11. Under the

1 definition at the bottom of page 11 of limit line detection  
2 zone it says it's a six-by-six foot area. However, if you  
3 have a wide curb lane you would want the detection zone to  
4 extend across that wider lane. So six-by-six works well for  
5 a 12 foot lane, a 10 foot lane.

6 So I would like to change the definition of the  
7 limit line detection zone to add a sentence that would say:  
8 For a lane width of 20 feet or greater, two six-foot-by-six-  
9 foot areas shall constitute the limit line detection zone.  
10 And so that would ensure if you have a wide lane you have  
11 got the detection to identify motorcycles or bicycles. So I  
12 would like to take that as a first action.

13 MR. GAMBOA: To include some language that would  
14 include those instances where you have a wider lane, okay.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Mr. Fisher,  
16 do you want to go over all your five items.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And then we'll do  
19 one motion?

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That would be the  
21 first one.

22 One page 12 about three-fourths of the way to the  
23 bottom it indicates a bicyclist push button may be used to  
24 supplement and then it lists the cases.

25 MR. GAMBOA: Yes.

1           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And the only one  
2 I have a concern about is Item C where it says it may be  
3 used where all of the conditions exist. And it says,  
4 vehicular right turns are either prohibited or not  
5 authorized. My reading of the Vehicle Code is that a  
6 bicyclist is allowed to move to the left of a right turning  
7 vehicle but is also allowed to stay near the curb. That's  
8 my reading of the Vehicle Code. So I wouldn't think you  
9 would have to require that right turns be prohibited to have  
10 a push button.

11           MR. GAMBOA: Well I can't answer that right now.  
12 I know that the thinking when they developed that part, they  
13 just wanted to make sure that the bicyclists were not in  
14 harms way by placing something like that so they were, they  
15 were trying to allow a little degree of safety. So that  
16 when there are places that supplement -- If you look at the  
17 diagram on page 16 it kind of shows the instances where we  
18 would prefer to have something like this.

19           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well again, I  
20 think bicyclists are allowed to be near the curb; they are  
21 also allowed to move away. So that's maybe an item we would  
22 want to consider.

23           MR. GAMBOA: Okay.

24           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: On page 13, page  
25 13 near the top is a support statement. Yet the, I think



1 the eighth line says a bicyclist push button is only allowed  
2 as a supplement because, and then it lists the situations.  
3 I think the situations that are listed, A, B, C, are indeed  
4 support statements because they are educational, they  
5 inform. However, when we have wording like, "is only  
6 allowed" that takes on the meaning of a standard, a shall  
7 condition. So on the prior page we said push button may be  
8 used, which is an option. So what I would suggest is that  
9 we delete -- let me see. That we change the sentence to  
10 read like a support statement.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So instead of saying  
12 "only allowed" say "may be used?"

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well that would  
14 make it an option. So yes, I would say --

15 MR. GAMBOA: So you want it to move from your  
16 suggestion --

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Again, I would  
18 say let's delete this sentence altogether because on a prior  
19 page we say a push button may be used. So we don't need  
20 another statement that conflicts with what that says, may  
21 only be used where. So I would suggest we delete that  
22 sentence.

23 MR. GAMBOA: Wait. The sentence that says, "A  
24 bicycle push button is only allowed." Is that the one you  
25 are referring to?

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

2 MR. GAMBOA: What about the subsequent?

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well you can  
4 eliminate A, B -- I mean, you can eliminate the letters A,  
5 B, C and just list those as educational content.

6 MR. GAMBOA: Okay.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Which is the form  
8 of a support statement.

9 Right above that, and I missed this. Right above  
10 that the sentence: "Accordingly, the limit line detection  
11 zone need not extend all the way to the curb or edge of  
12 pavement." Let me see.

13 MR. GAMBOA: That was the idea that in instances  
14 where vehicles are, when they go over the limit line.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes. I think the  
16 issue is -- Again, my reading of the Vehicle Code is that  
17 bicyclists are allowed to be riding right next to the curb.  
18 And therefore I would think you would want to have detection  
19 there for those who elect to ride next to the curb. This  
20 sentence says, "need not extend all the way to the curb."  
21 Well, that's an opinion embedded in a support statement so I  
22 was going to recommend that that be deleted as well.

23 And then as we get to the diagrams on the next few  
24 pages. The diagram on page 14. I think we should show the  
25 push button as option rather than it being deleted. Because

1 again, a bicyclist is allowed to ride next to the curb.

2 MR. GAMBOA: Again, I think the thinking was, the  
3 reason why they wanted to do that, because they just felt  
4 that it would put bicyclists -- I know they are allowed to  
5 do it but, you know, should we be putting things where  
6 people may be in conflict with a vehicle?

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well if you do  
8 that, okay.

9 MR. GAMBOA: That was the whole idea for that.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, all right.

11 MR. GAMBOA: I mean, it is a supplement. So, I  
12 mean, you know, there might instances where you would do  
13 that but I think the thinking is let's not try to put it  
14 somewhere where they can, you know. That detection is  
15 supposed to work.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The what  
17 detection is supposed to work?

18 MR. GAMBOA: The one that is supposed to be put in  
19 there.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You mean the  
21 limit line?

22 MR. GAMBOA: Whatever detection, when the bicycle  
23 detection gets put in it's supposed to --

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Well if  
25 it's the sense that we don't want to allow the option of

1 putting in a push button then we need to show a detector  
2 that extends to the curb, for those who drive next to the  
3 curb. Otherwise we don't detect them.

4 MR. GAMBOA: So you're saying maybe show detection  
5 all the way, all the way across.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right, if the  
7 lane is 20 feet or more.

8 MR. GAMBOA: I could see where there is a merit to  
9 that.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And then  
11 finally for the diagram on page 16. For those push buttons  
12 we would say those are optional. Just to limit, to label it  
13 as optional.

14 MR. GAMBOA: As optional, okay. Okay.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So I guess if we  
16 first decide kind of the issue which repeats itself on  
17 several pages regarding riding next to the curb. If we can  
18 resolve that issue then I think we can resolve several of  
19 the points that I've raised.

20 MR. GAMBOA: Basically if you are allowing a wider  
21 detection area. Is that what you are referring to?

22 MR. GAMBOA: Right.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

24 MR. GAMBOA: And that a bicyclist is allowed to  
25 ride next to the curb. Now maybe it's not always a good

1     thing to do if there are right turns but they are not  
2     prohibited from doing so.

3             MR. GAMBOA:   Okay, all right.

4             COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:   Okay.   That's it?

5             COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER:   Oh, and I missed  
6     one other one.   Page 13, near the bottom on the formula.  
7     That the green plus yellow plus --

8             MR. GAMBOA:   Yes.

9             COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER:   -- red clearance  
10    is greater than.   Shouldn't that be greater than or equal  
11    to?

12            MR. GAMBOA:   Yes.

13            COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER:   Okay.

14            MR. GAMBOA:   But I think it was equal to but maybe  
15    it was the underlining.

16            COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER:   Oh, okay.

17            MR. GAMBOA:   You didn't see that?

18            (Laughter.)

19            COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER:   I missed that.

20            MR. GAMBOA:   It's a joke.

21            COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER:   All right.

22            COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:   Okay.

23            MR. GAMBOA:   Any other questions?   Yes sir.

24            COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:   Chief.

25            COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD:   Kind of along the lines

1 with some of the things that John brought up. The bicycle  
2 is required to be as close as practical to the right hand  
3 edge and there are exceptions when they can move over. But  
4 then that doesn't mean that all bets are off and the bicycle  
5 gets to go wherever they want on the entire road. So what  
6 John was saying about extending those detection zones  
7 farther on the right side for those wide lanes on the right,  
8 shouldn't the detection zone cover more of the lane in the  
9 next lane over so that the bike was riding on the right hand  
10 edge of that lane. It could detect the bike as well.  
11 Because if the bicyclist moves over to a lane to the left  
12 like they are allowed to do in certain circumstances, they  
13 have got to be able to trip that detector as well riding as  
14 close as they can to the right side of that lane.

15 MR. GAMBOA: Well the hope is for bicyclists --  
16 and Bob could help me. But when they ride they are going to  
17 take command of the lane if they are in lanes one and two,  
18 one or two. Let's say there's three lanes abreast, you  
19 know, for arguments sake. So they are going to be -- They  
20 are going to take over that lane and then try to be in the  
21 middle of that lane, which will set off the detector.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: But not all of them  
23 will, is what I'm saying.

24 MR. GAMBOA: No, not all of them will. But the  
25 law, by going to the letter of the law that is what the

1 thinking is. But in instances where they are not riding  
2 fast enough they will have to go more to the right hand side  
3 or the third lane.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: So if we are defining  
5 though what these detection zones should look like the  
6 ultimate goal is that the bicycles are able to trip it and  
7 not stuck at lights. Why not make that a wider detection  
8 zone.

9 MR. GAMBOA: For what lanes, one and two, left  
10 turns? Or all three all the way across?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: For the lane, yes, that  
12 the bikes would be in.

13 MR. GAMBOA: I'll let Bob answer that question  
14 real quick.

15 DR. SHANTEAU: I'm Bob Shanteau. I'm  
16 transportation engineering liaison for the California  
17 Association of Bicycling Organizations and the bicycle  
18 representative on the AB 1581 subcommittee.

19 The answer to your questions, Mr. Fisher's and  
20 Chief Maynard's, is towards the bottom of page eight where  
21 there's a figure.

22 In fact, Devinder, can you bring it up? It should  
23 be, I should have one called Agenda. And then go to page  
24 eight. You'll see that we have a diagram there showing a  
25 right hook conflict. Yes, it is legal. It is strictly

1 legal.

2           You'll have to hit Alt-Tab to go, to go between  
3 applications there, to go between windows. Alt-Tab.

4           It is strictly legal for a through bicyclist to go  
5 through from the curb, yes. It is strictly legal for a car  
6 to go through from the right curb, yes. It is strictly  
7 legal for a motorcycle to go straight through from the right  
8 curb, yes. But do you want them to?

9           If the lane is 20 feet wide or wider -- If the  
10 lane is 20 feet wide or wider that's one lane. It's still  
11 one lane, sirs. It's still one lane. One lane means one  
12 line of traffic. It doesn't mean that bicyclists keep to  
13 the right and next to the curb.

14           We don't want them there, that's where you get  
15 right-hooked. We have lost bicyclists. We lost two in  
16 Portland a couple of years ago. We lose bicyclists -- we  
17 lost one in Santa Barbara. We lost one in Santa Cruz.  
18 Killed, literally killed in right hook collisions. We don't  
19 want bicyclists there. That's why we don't want to put the  
20 push button there. We don't want to encourage bicyclists to  
21 ride against the curb, where there's a wide right lane in  
22 particular.

23           And to answer your question, if there are -- to  
24 turn to the wide right lane example, Sheet 1-A on page 14.  
25 That shows, that's the wide right lane that you were asking



1 about. And there it shows the limit line detection zone  
2 starting three feet from the lane line, which is where that  
3 loop would normally be.

4 I have been a signal engineer much of my life.  
5 And that's where you would put the loop is about three feet  
6 from the lane line because the loop is six feet wide. Right  
7 turners would turn from the curb. After all, right turns  
8 are required, the Vehicle Code requires that right turns be  
9 made from as close to the curb as practical. So you  
10 certainly don't want the bicyclist and the right turner both  
11 against the right curb because then the right-turning car is  
12 going to right hook that bicyclist. We have lost bicyclists  
13 that way.

14 So part of what we bicyclists have committed to do  
15 once this is passed, it's premature right now. But once  
16 this is passed we will initiate an education program among  
17 bicycle -- we will be distributing leaflets to bicycle shops  
18 and to bicyclists in as many places as we can find them  
19 about where this detection zone is, where they can be  
20 detected.

21 An important thing we found out when we were in  
22 our subcommittee deliberations was that the local traffic  
23 engineers, and remember, we have traffic engineers  
24 representing three cities on our subcommittee, the city of  
25 San Francisco, the City of Long Beach and the City of LA.

1 And all three of them did not want to have to put down paint  
2 markings on any of these new intersections. And to put them  
3 down on existing intersections that would be a pain also,  
4 but especially not on the new intersections.

5 So if you are not going to put paint down on the  
6 new intersections to indicate to bicycles where to stop,  
7 bicycles have to know where to stop. And that's the simple  
8 rule. The simple rule is, if the lane is say 12 feet wide,  
9 stop in the middle. If it's wider, stop about six feet from  
10 the lane line. Simple, straightforward, nothing to think  
11 about.

12 But if the rule is well gee, if it's wide then  
13 push the button, or you may be detected if you are in the  
14 lane somewhere. But a right-turning car. What are we going  
15 to do about right-turning cars and bicyclists? We don't  
16 want to detect right-turning cars but we do want to detect  
17 bicyclists. The standard way of doing that, standard  
18 operating procedure among signal engineers is to put one  
19 loop out three feet from the lane line. And that's exactly  
20 what we are proposing, that's how we came up with that  
21 recommendation and that's why we are making the  
22 recommendation.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Chief, do you have  
24 any more questions on this?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I'm just, I'm not clear

1 on why if we are proposing a change or a standard that we  
2 would be spelling out where to put loops where we know that  
3 they wouldn't detect some bicyclists. Why not, why not  
4 extend them where bicycles will be riding. That's my  
5 comment.

6 DR. SHANTEAU: Because, perhaps because we expect  
7 bicyclists to ride in a different place. We don't expect  
8 bicyclists to ride against a curb, they can be killed there.  
9 We don't want people to be killed.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And I think both  
11 sides have made their point, let's move on to the next  
12 issue, Mr. Knowles.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Just a quick follow-up  
14 though on that point. Are you saying the standard as you  
15 are proposing it would object to a very wide detection zone?  
16 I mean, if I am using video I have no constraints on how  
17 wide I make that detection zone. So this is a minimum  
18 standard. There is nothing that keeps me from setting up  
19 more detection.

20 DR. SHANTEAU: Yes, it's a minimum.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. Because there's  
22 nothing in here that clearly states that. So I just wanted  
23 to be --

24 DR. SHANTEAU: It says, a minimum six-by-six foot  
25 detection zone.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Approximate six-by-six.  
2 And that's my concern. Especially for a controller with a  
3 limited number of channel.

4 DR. SHANTEAU: Sorry, we should have added the  
5 word minimum.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay.

7 DR. SHANTEAU: We'll do that.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Because I want that to  
9 be clear. That if I am going to provide bicycle detection I  
10 am going to use a fairly wide zone to blanket the street.

11 DR. SHANTEAU: Okay.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I had some other  
13 questions about your thinking when you were setting this up.  
14 It appears to me that the legislation talks about using  
15 normal, professional practices when setting this up. But  
16 there's elements of this that look more like pedestrian  
17 detection than vehicle detection, even though we have been  
18 arguing that a bicycle is a vehicle and not a pedestrian.

19 Like your clearance interval. It's nothing like  
20 what we would apply to any motorized vehicle.

21 MR. GAMBOA: Well.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: With a vehicle the only  
23 clearance interval is our all-red clearance. A yellow is  
24 just a warning that the red is coming, that the green is  
25 terminating, yellow is not a clearance interval. And even

1    when we set our minimum greens we are trying to get the  
2    vehicle past the limit line. And then you can't start even  
3    though your light has turned green until all the vehicles  
4    legally in the intersection have cleared the intersection.  
5    So this seems like a very different practice than what we  
6    use for any other vehicle in --

7               MR. GAMBOA: Well that's the tricky part. We  
8    typically -- as you know, I guess your background, I could  
9    tell, the way we do yellow intervals, on speed. But  
10   bicycles they can't really do that. The type of yellow  
11   interval we would do would be diametrically opposed to the  
12   way we do it for vehicles. I mean, you were talking about  
13   way longer yellow intervals to get a bicycle through the  
14   intersection.

15              COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And we couldn't do that  
16   because of the motorized vehicles.

17              MR. GAMBOA: You can't do that. So we are making  
18   an assumption that bicycles will stop, for the most part, if  
19   they see a yellow. Before they hit the limit line they are  
20   going to have enough, they will have enough reaction time to  
21   stop before they get there. But if they are in the middle  
22   of the intersection I don't -- I can't say where their  
23   standing would be, if they could get through the  
24   intersection or not.

25              COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So if I understand this

1 correctly, we need to program a minimum green --

2 MR. GAMBOA: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- plus a yellow, plus  
4 all-red clearance. Plus an additional six seconds because  
5 of the start-up loss time for the bicycles?

6 MR. GAMBOA: Well, you would do the -- you would  
7 have to come up with whatever the width of the intersection.  
8 So let's make it easy on ourselves, let's say the width of  
9 the intersection with the bike is 150 feet. That's a big  
10 one. And then it's 15 feet per second so you're talking  
11 about 10 seconds.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

13 MR. GAMBOA: Plus the start-up time is 16 seconds.  
14 This is a real wide intersection, of course. On the other  
15 side you need to have, if it's 45 miles an hour well let's  
16 say it's 4.5 seconds yellow. Subtract that from the 16,  
17 plus your all-red, maybe a second and a half, so it's 6  
18 seconds. So you basically have to come up with 10 seconds  
19 of minimum green.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Which means every left  
21 turn pocket has a ten second minimum green. Every minor  
22 street has a ten second.

23 MR. GAMBOA: Well.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Because quite often the  
25 left or the minor streets, which have the biggest impact on

1 my capacity. My minor streets crossing the main street,  
2 that's the longest crossing. I'm looking at generally ten  
3 second minimum greens. So my five second minimum greens are  
4 just doubling, you know. I typically use a five second  
5 minimum green. Because clearly the formula is saying,  
6 minimum green, plus yellow, plus red, and then it refers to  
7 an additional six seconds.

8 MR. GAMBOA: Um-hmm.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So I need to add that  
10 on to the formula.

11 DR. SHANTEAU: Bob Shanteau again. The answer to  
12 your question is on page 11. It's that little graph where  
13 we are showing there's a horizontal distance of 6 seconds  
14 and then a slanted line at 14.7, approximately 15 per  
15 second.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I understand the  
17 theory.

18 DR. SHANTEAU: I addressed --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I am trying to  
20 understand the impact and make sure I understand your  
21 proposal.

22 DR. SHANTEAU: We have to know what, we have to  
23 know what your crossing distance is. The crossing distance  
24 is on the vertical. If your crossing distance -- I just  
25 answered this question from Sean Skehan who is the City of

1 LA representative on the AB 1581 subcommittee. He asked me  
2 this. He said, supposing my left turn distance, left turn  
3 crossing distance is 60 feet. What is the minimum green  
4 time. I said, well you take 60, divide it 15, you get 4.  
5 Add 6, you get 10. Subtract -- how long is your yellow,  
6 Sean? He said, 3. How long is your all-red? One. So you  
7 subtract 4 from 10 and you get 6. So his answer was 6  
8 seconds. He said, we'll we're currently using 5 so we're  
9 fine with that.

10 What is your crossing, left turn crossing time?  
11 Or left turn crossing distance?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: As I mentioned the  
13 biggest, the biggest impacting is at a minor street, a  
14 residential collector crossing a side arterial, you know.  
15 In a city like Pleasanton it was easy to have Hopyard Road,  
16 you know, a 12 lane road. So it's an exceptionally wide  
17 street, you know, maybe 130 feet. And I would literally  
18 have to be increasing my minimum green time from the  
19 existing five seconds to 12 seconds.

20 DR. SHANTEAU: Well if it's -- you say 130 feet?  
21 You go to 130 feet on this drawing, we end up with about  
22 approximately 15 seconds to cross for bicyclist crossing  
23 time. Subtract, what's your yellow?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Minor street, three  
25 seconds. All-red clearance is two.



1 DR. SHANTEAU: Okay, that's five.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That's five seconds.

3 So I've got a ten second minimum green every single time.

4 DR. SHANTEAU: Yes, unless you can discriminate.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And 24/7.

6 DR. SHANTEAU: Unless you can discriminate between

7 bicyclists and motor vehicles the answer to your question is

8 yes. Every time that signal on the side street turns green

9 that will be your minimum green time.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So every time I have a

11 single car a ten second minimum green.

12 DR. SHANTEAU: Yes.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And if you have a

14 bicycle --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And so that's my

16 concern. No, because the detector doesn't know a bicycle

17 from a car.

18 MR. GAMBOA: No, they need to be smarter.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So to me, that's the

20 difficulty with conformance with professional engineering

21 practices. This doesn't reflect our current practices.

22 Because we don't treat cars this way. The minimum green is

23 basically to deal with that start-up lost time. They see

24 the green, they go. Kind of like the walk signal. Time to

25 react to the signal and start walking. But our clearance

1 interval, the all-red is the only thing we use with regards  
2 to a clearance interval for a vehicle, and a bicycle is a  
3 vehicle. I just wanted to get that clarification.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, let's --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Let me get one other  
6 point of clarification.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, let's not spend  
8 too much time on a single issue. I want to get all the  
9 issues out and give some time for people to speak in the  
10 audience and then we'll come back. Mr. Knowles, next issue.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes. The only other  
12 point I wanted to make with regards to what has been about  
13 the detection area is that as a city traffic engineer and  
14 having been one for several cities I am concerned not so  
15 much with the adult riders as my kids going to school. And  
16 that's where I have a problem with a six-year-old or even an  
17 eight-year-old taking the lane versus being on the right  
18 side of the road.

19 So I do take exception that there are some  
20 individuals on bicycles that I would rather have on the  
21 right side of the road than out in the middle or the far  
22 left side of a 20 foot lane.

23 MR. GAMBOA: What do you encourage your six-year-  
24 old when they come to a signalized intersection?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Walk across in the

1 cross walk. But we are establishing a rule here. I'm just  
2 saying I take exception to the idea that every cyclist needs  
3 to be taking the lane. Some do need to be on the far right  
4 side. And a lot of cyclists like to stand with one foot on  
5 the curb. And that's why in Thousand Oaks we are putting  
6 the push buttons on the outside of the poles because it was  
7 right where they like to stop. But okay, that's the end of  
8 my questions.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, Mr. Babico.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, no comments.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, just before I  
12 go to opening for public hearing just one minor comment I  
13 have. Whenever you use a formula I suggest you use a legend  
14 right under the formula explaining each of the terms that  
15 you have used. You have explained the terms in the  
16 paragraph preceding the formula. I'm talking about page 13,  
17 about signal timing guidance. You have a formula and you  
18 have some parameters in there. It says, G minimum, Y, R  
19 Clear, W. Be very specific what they are. Although they  
20 are explained in the paragraph it always helps when you have  
21 a formula in the manual to have a legend. Especially in  
22 this case. And the W is always questionable. Okay, where  
23 do I measure from, what to what. So that's one suggestion.

24 Colleagues, if you don't have any more questions I  
25 am going to open it to the public, this is a public hearing

1 item.

2           Seeing none, thank you very much. We may ask you  
3 later to come back when we hear from the rest of the folks  
4 in the audience.

5           Anybody who wishes to address the committee on  
6 this item please step up to the podium. Chad. Please  
7 mention your name, your affiliation, and please try to be  
8 very brief on your comments. I will give you three minutes  
9 each and at the end of three minute I will rudely interrupt.  
10 Go ahead.

11           MR. DORNSIFE: Chad Dornsife, Best Highway Safety  
12 Practices Institute. I was recently at a security  
13 conference for perimeter security and facility security.  
14 With video analytics and some of the new controllers that  
15 are really becoming quite inexpensive you could do every one  
16 of these call cancels, pedestrians, ADA, everything for a  
17 few cents on the dollar without traffic loops, without  
18 stanchions, without call buttons. And do it all  
19 electronically at very low expense with very high  
20 efficiency.

21           So if you have a bicycle who clears early you call  
22 cancel. If you have a pedestrian that doesn't go in that  
23 direction you call cancel. If you have a person in a  
24 wheelchair it sees them, tracks their speed when they clear,  
25 they hold it until they clear. The point is that the

1 technology is advancing way beyond the language of this bill  
2 and this bill should facilitate new solutions that solve all  
3 these call problems. And ten seconds every time a light  
4 changes is crazy.

5           So on that particular one if a bicycle approaches  
6 it would hold the signal until the bicyclist cleared by  
7 demand. If he's slower it would hold it longer and if he  
8 wasn't it would clear it sooner. But it would only activate  
9 on a bicyclist or a pedestrian, the rest of the time it  
10 would be cycling for the automotive.

11           Or if you had a tractor-trailer with double  
12 trailers it would see that and it could hold it longer. The  
13 point is it can discern a truck from a pedestrian, a child,  
14 a bicyclist or a motorcycle and there is no infrastructure  
15 to put in the ground other than a camera on the pole.

16           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. The next  
17 speaker, please.

18           MR. AMUNDSON: Hi, my name is Marty Amundson with  
19 LA County Department of Public Works. We just had a couple  
20 of concerns similar to John Fisher's about the bicycle push  
21 button usage. We kind of feel like there are people that  
22 would go out and go into the detection area but there are  
23 some people that aren't, probably would be afraid to go out  
24 towards there and still will hug the curb. Even though  
25 through education you might be able to tell them you need to

1 move away from the curb, away to avoid the right hook, there  
2 will still be people that will sit at the curb. And that  
3 you might want to have a pedestrian push button or you might  
4 need to have some more technology to have something.

5           So we have a concern that we would like to have  
6 the push button be able to be used based off of engineering  
7 judgment about watching people, what they do at an  
8 intersection and not having this restricted, saying you  
9 cannot use this at all unless you restrict right turns.  
10 Which is almost impossible to do at every intersection.

11           But you should consider all bicyclists, not just  
12 recreational bicyclists or this person that is just riding  
13 to work that doesn't even know all the rules but they just  
14 like to hang out by the thing.

15           The other thing we have concerns with is the  
16 minimum green. We do have some very, very large  
17 intersections in the county that we have. And if we are  
18 doing stuff with the left turns. And we did -- if we are  
19 measuring distances of up to 200 feet across you are going  
20 to have minimum greens for left turns that will average  
21 about 15 seconds and even up to 18 or 19 seconds just for a  
22 left turn. And so that is a concern with us with the  
23 distance.

24           I mean, I think there should be a minimum time but  
25 there should also be a limit. Hey, you should not exceed

1    this amount for certain time limits on this.  Because it's  
2    like, we're going to get complaints at these large  
3    intersections when you just have one car at the intersection  
4    and they pull away and then we still have to time out  
5    another 15 seconds just to make sure, just in case there is  
6    a bicyclist out in the intersection.  That we are going to  
7    get complaints from citizens saying, hey, why isn't this  
8    left turn, why is it stuck on.  Nobody is there.  One car  
9    goes and we are sitting there for 15 -- If you have got an  
10   eight phase intersection you start wasting gas and time for  
11   everybody at these intersections.

12               And that's pretty much our two concerns.

13               COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:  Thank you.

14               MR. AMUNDSON:  Thank you.

15               COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:  Next speaker.

16               MR. SHAO:  Hi, my name is Bill Shao with City of  
17   Los Angeles Department of Transportation.  My only comment  
18   to this was I wished to see instead of a formula, I would  
19   like to see a table like Caltrans table 4D-101.  Or at a  
20   minimum yellow, the table which -- it's a table which it  
21   makes it like non-ambiguous.  It's totally straightforward.  
22   The reason for that is the legality, legal inquiries.

23               I would hate to see some -- one subject matter  
24   expert, you know, in a court of law, presenting this as this  
25   is my computation, here is the city staff presenting this

1 computation, and leave up to juries to decide whose  
2 computation is, quote, correct versus non-correct. So I  
3 would rather have it as a table, thank you.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Anybody else who  
5 wishes to speak?

6 MR. BAROSS: Good morning. My name is Jim Baross.  
7 I am the vice chair of the California Bicycle Advisory  
8 Committee. I also represent two statewide bicycling  
9 organizations and the League of American Bicyclists, which  
10 has been training cyclists since 1976 to operate properly on  
11 the roadway. And I have a couple of comments.

12 First, I don't care, especially where you put the  
13 ped button. If it's a deal breaker to get a ped button  
14 where it's going to be dangerous for people but you think  
15 it's appropriate, it's better to get the detection in place.  
16 Right now we have bicyclists who are at risk at  
17 intersections that will not change for them. Will not  
18 change for them. And many enforcement personnel are giving  
19 them tickets for treating that signal as inoperative when  
20 they go through when it's red. So we are in a tough  
21 situation here. The Legislature agreed with us a year and a  
22 half ago. We are pushing two years since the legislation.  
23 It's time to get off the ball boys and get our cyclists safe  
24 on the roadway.

25 On the issue of timing and phasing. If you cannot



1 provide actuation which is distinguishing slower and faster  
2 crossers you need to provide for the slower crosser.  
3 Bicyclists are going to get killed, hurt. What is the  
4 alternative if you are not going to provide 15 seconds for  
5 the bicyclists? Somebody gets delayed, that's unfortunate,  
6 but it also means bicyclists are less at risk and more  
7 likely they will make it through.

8           As for riding next to the right hand side of the  
9 road. Motorists are not supposed to be next to the right  
10 hand side of the road when they are going straight through,  
11 neither are bicyclists. Your children don't belong in  
12 traffic if they don't know how to handle traffic. They  
13 belong on the sidewalk crossing as a pedestrian.

14           Same with bicyclists who don't know how to handle  
15 traffic. If they don't know how to handle traffic they need  
16 to take the pedestrian choice you are providing. If there  
17 is a pedestrian crossing there is probably a push button for  
18 the pedestrian or some kind of way to be actuated and that  
19 is the appropriate accommodation.

20           Not to encourage or allow or certainly putting the  
21 bike detection logo next to the curb invites right hook  
22 conflicts and opportunities for bicyclists to get hurt.

23           As far as the gentleman, I think you're from the  
24 California Highway Patrol. If we can make detection areas  
25 wider. In other words, this should be referring to a

1 minimum six-by-six. If we can provide more opportunities  
2 for the bicyclist who for some reason needs to be or chooses  
3 to be where it's legal to be in the other lanes, left turn,  
4 second or third lane, fine. I don't think this precludes  
5 that, it just hits at a minimum.

6 And lastly, at least for my points. It's time,  
7 it's past time. Bicyclists are legitimate road users. They  
8 haven't been accommodated. The Legislature has decided they  
9 should be accommodated. It's up to us to come with some  
10 minimum standards to get this in place. If it needs to be  
11 or can be modified in the future when technology becomes  
12 available let's do it then but let's get this on the road  
13 now. Thanks.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Can I ask him a  
15 question?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Sir.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Jim, could you come  
19 back.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, I just  
21 wanted to make sure I understood what you were saying. For  
22 a wide curb lane.

23 MR. BAROSS: Yes.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Would you prefer  
25 that the detection extend across the width of the wide curb

1 lane? Or are you satisfied just to have a six-foot-by-six-  
2 foot area for the wide curb lane?

3 MR. BAROSS: I think it's fine to have more area  
4 for detection than less. I wouldn't want, for instance, if  
5 you did have a wide area, to have any indication to the  
6 bicyclists that they are most appropriate next to the curb  
7 when they are going straight through. But if the detection  
8 area could cover the whole space, fine. My problem, of  
9 course, was with the push button, which encourages them to  
10 be to the right.

11 Or because there is the option of applying the  
12 bicycle logo detection, the paint marking on the pavement  
13 for the sweet spot when the detection area is only quite  
14 small. I certainly wouldn't want it where it is going to  
15 encourage cyclists to do what we have been teaching for 30-  
16 plus years not to do.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So you would want  
18 the in-roadway detection but not the push button detection  
19 because it encourages bicyclists to stay to the right.

20 MR. BAROSS: Well I think for your level of  
21 service, your concern for level of service of an  
22 intersection, I don't think you want detection off to the  
23 right. You are going to cause a green light to be triggered  
24 when the bicyclist or the motorist is turning right, which  
25 is legal in a right turn. If you are concerned with level

1 of service and throughput I don't think you want detection  
2 where people are turning right, not where they are going  
3 straight. But if that is what it takes to get bicyclists  
4 detected, please. I am trying to get bicycles detected.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other members of  
7 the public?

8 Okay, seeing none I close the public hearing on  
9 the item. There are a couple of individuals in the audience  
10 that have helped also. I see Maggie hiding there from  
11 Caltrans. She has been contributing. And Dave Roseman back  
12 there from City of Long Beach, on this issue. But Jim and  
13 Bob Shanteau have been very critical in developing this,  
14 working with the Bicycle Advisory Committee, and we  
15 appreciate all your effort.

16 Okay, well let's bring it back to the Committee.  
17 Colleagues, I think this is like the second or third issue  
18 that we sent to the subcommittee. And then we have  
19 subcommittees and they meet and they come with language and  
20 then they come back here and then again we have more issues  
21 with it but maybe that's the nature of the beast.

22 So where do we go from here? I think if I  
23 captured everything clearly there are three primary issues.  
24 There's some minor ones here and there. But one is the  
25 definition of the detection area. How do you define that.

1           Second is how we treat the push button. I think  
2 the counties and the cities would like to have the option of  
3 placing the push button and not being restricted. But then  
4 I understand the bicycle group concerns.

5           And probably bigger than those two is the issue of  
6 timing. On the issue of timing. My two cents on the issue  
7 of timing is that it's like any other new state law. It is  
8 going to inconvenience the cities and the counties. You  
9 have to go and redo your minimum greens if this passes, if  
10 the language passes.

11           But apparently the state legislators felt that the  
12 way that we are treating bicycle traffic on our highways is  
13 not adequately safe so that's why they passed 1581. So I'll  
14 be the last one to say this but next time, if we adopt this  
15 the next time somebody calls and says, hey, why am I waiting  
16 here? Why is the green on the side street so long? Call  
17 your state legislators.

18           Anyway, so Mr. Fisher had the most comments and I  
19 think Chief Maynard and Mr. Knowles also captured some of  
20 them. So where do we go from here? Do we want to make, is  
21 there anyone ready to make a motion? I think if you want to  
22 have a motion there are probably seven issues that need to  
23 be modified according to what I heard.

24           COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Mr. Chairman.

25           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, Mr. Mansourian.

1           COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I have one question  
2 from John on timing. And the reason I am picking John is  
3 because of the impact to large cities, I want to learn.

4           And then I want to ask Robert about the law  
5 enforcement and the bike, whether they belong on the right  
6 or not.

7           So on the issue of timing, John, just look at it  
8 from a big city point of view. So we have got to get the  
9 bicyclists across in a safe manner, right. They can't rush  
10 it. So the math comes out to whatever it is, 15 seconds.  
11 It's no different than when we had to accommodate for  
12 wheelchairs crossing on the pedestrian crosswalk and that  
13 created congestion. But we couldn't come up with any way to  
14 get them to go faster.

15           So if I am correct on what I just said then that's  
16 a given and it will create congestion. I don't know what  
17 else we can do. Other than then maybe we can come up with a  
18 way of detecting bicycles. So then when there is -- in the  
19 examples like Marty of LA County gave, you have a long  
20 timing for only one car because the current detectors cannot  
21 pick the difference between a bicyclist and a car. So if we  
22 would install --

23           So what I am saying is, does it make sense for  
24 large jurisdictions, or rural counties like us, have a  
25 choice of either you live with the long timing or detect the

1 bicycles. Am I understanding that issue correctly or is it  
2 much bigger than that?

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well I think as  
4 has been pointed out, for many of our conventional  
5 intersections the minimum time would be close to the range  
6 of what we are using now. But I think when you get to the  
7 skewed intersection or the very wide intersection you are  
8 going to have some minimum times which sometimes far exceeds  
9 the demand that is there. And I think ultimately the answer  
10 is to have some sort of discriminating detectors which can  
11 distinguish between a bicycle and a vehicle and somehow  
12 provide the time associated with what it is detecting.

13 Now I've got people on my staff, Sean and Bill,  
14 who may know the feasibility of that. But I think  
15 ultimately technology is going to have to find a way to  
16 ensure that we don't have a lot of wasted signal timing out  
17 there. I am not sure that technology is there quite yet.  
18 However, we will be experimenting with a detector that  
19 supposedly can distinguish the mode of vehicle that is over  
20 it. But I think the jury will be out on that for awhile.

21 But the bottom line is is this the law. And, you  
22 know, it is going to create some inefficiencies at some  
23 locations. So I think we need to pursue technology to make  
24 sure that we don't have a lot of wasted time at some of  
25 these unique type of intersections.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Deborah.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I had a comment related to  
3 that. Does it make sense then to add some language that  
4 allows for that technology when it is available to be used.  
5 In lieu or in there. Where does it state that?

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes. "The limit  
7 line detection system that can discriminate between  
8 bicyclists and vehicles may be used to extend the length of  
9 the minimum green." I'm not sure we have all seen it yet.  
10 I'm not sure to what degree it's developed yet. But you  
11 know where there is a need there's a clever inventor out  
12 there.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: If there's bucks to  
14 be made somebody will make it.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Can I then go on my  
16 second question?

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Robert, last time we  
19 also talked about whether the bicyclist, this issue of  
20 whether they can be on the right side or they can't.  
21 Remember, we had all of that discussion. And that appears  
22 to be the issue. I would appreciate hearing your point of  
23 view on the law, the law enforcement side. Not the  
24 philosophy part that people say you belong there or you  
25 don't. But are we creating a conflict with the existing



1 vehicle code by doing what is being proposed? Or this is  
2 not a conflict, it's just a philosophical difference.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: As far as which  
4 proposal?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The part about  
6 bicyclists being on the right lane and the push button and  
7 whether, you know. That's where I need your, your advice.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Well the Vehicle Code  
9 says that the bicyclists shall travel as close as practical  
10 to the right hand edge and then there are exceptions for  
11 when the bicycle is allowed to move away from location. And  
12 at the case of an intersection where right turns are  
13 permitted the bicyclist is permitted to move over to the  
14 left to allow sufficient room for a car to turn right  
15 without creating that right hook conflict. It doesn't say  
16 they have to move over to the left.

17 And I think when you get to the discussion or  
18 comments like, well we don't want bicycles there, that's  
19 when you get into the philosophical discussion. The Vehicle  
20 Code says they shall be to the right except in these  
21 circumstances. Then they can move over to a safer location.

22 But if we are talking about minimum greens and  
23 those kinds of things that have to be in effect 24/7 to  
24 account for bicyclists to allow safe passage, what about the  
25 times when you are on a road where there is no traffic?

1 Since the bicyclist is allowed and is supposed to be as far  
2 to the right as possible, if they are the only ones out  
3 there and there is nobody else there is no reason for a  
4 bicycle to move over to the left and take the center of an  
5 adjacent lane.

6 So if in that circumstance they can't be detected  
7 by a loop detector that goes far enough across the lane to  
8 detect them then I don't know why there is a problem with  
9 having the option of having the push button so that they can  
10 get across in a safe manner at some point in time without  
11 having to run the red or, you know, whatever else they are  
12 having to do. Did I answer your question?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes, thank you.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, anybody else?  
15 Mr. Knowles.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I would recommend that  
17 in the interest of getting something out there that  
18 standardizes the installation of bicycle detection, that I  
19 would recommend voting on this section by section so that we  
20 can take the issue of the detection separately from the  
21 timing. There are so many issues as we go through this word  
22 by word that --

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It's more important to  
25 me to get the detection out there than to specify right now

1 exactly what the timing should be.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Again just to remind  
3 everybody. Whatever we do today here, ultimately this thing  
4 is not in effect until Caltrans issues the policy directive.  
5 So the idea -- so let's move and I don't know how long that  
6 is going to take.

7 But there is a suggestion that you look at the  
8 issue of detection and timing separately. Colleagues, what  
9 is your pleasure on that? Do you think it's productive?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Mr. Chairman?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Mr. Knowles, if I --  
12 sorry, Mr. Babico. Mr. Knowles, if I understand you  
13 correctly, you may feel comfortable with the detection issue  
14 but you may have some reservations on the timing part.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Strongly, yes.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: But if you do that  
17 then Caltrans has to issue two policy directives. One  
18 policy directive is going to amend MUTCD only on the  
19 detection. And then whenever the issue of timing is  
20 resolved then that is another policy directive.

21 Mr. Babico.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yes. Well, we do have a  
23 committee that they prepared these findings, whether they  
24 are private or within Caltrans. And they hear all the  
25 comments and recommendations. Why don't we have them to

1 take this and bring them back next CTCDC meeting with the  
2 resolution.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That was the idea,  
4 that there was a subcommittee that was formed that was  
5 chaired by Mr. Shanteau and we had representation.

6 DR. SHANTEAU: By Ahmad.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Pardon.

8 DR. SHANTEAU: Ahmad, Ahmad.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It was chaired by  
10 Caltrans.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: By Mr. Rastegarpour  
12 from Caltrans. And it was -- we had participation from Long  
13 Beach, LA and other cities and Caltrans of course. And they  
14 worked on this. And then they took this to the Bicycle  
15 Advisory Committee, which is a Caltrans committee. So this  
16 is the result of their work.

17 Now if you are suggesting that they take these  
18 comments that they heard today back to the subcommittee and  
19 to the committee that's, that's an approach and you are  
20 welcome to make a motion if that's what you want.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I am making that motion.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So what is your  
23 motion?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: To bring this subject to  
25 the next meeting after considering and resolving these

1 comments and issues raised by the CTCDC panel.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: All the issues that  
3 were raised by all the parties?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I have a motion on  
6 the floor. Is there a second?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Can I --

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Hold on. If motions  
9 don't get seconded they don't go. I have a motion. Is  
10 there a second on the motion?

11 Seeing none the motion dies.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I tried.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: May I?

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes sir.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I think, I think we  
16 owe it to the committee members who put a lot of hours, and  
17 ourselves, to get rolling on this. The subcommittee is  
18 making a recommendation to us. It's in front of us. We in  
19 turn are going to make a recommendation to Caltrans. Let's  
20 do that. Let's do whatever part of the subcommittee  
21 recommendation that we don't like. We don't need to agree  
22 with them, just like Caltrans doesn't need to agree with us.  
23 But let's go on.

24 My suggestion is, let's start with a motion of  
25 adopting what they have recommended. And then any part we

1 don't like go ahead and change it. And then at the end see  
2 if we have it or not. I think we need to resolve this  
3 issue. Construction season is upon us and I think we need  
4 to be out there, not wait another whole year.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: That's my  
7 recommendation.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Henley.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes, there are a couple  
10 of things I think we can all agree on in that these are the  
11 minimum standards. And I think we talked about changing a  
12 word so that it would make it clear that there is a minimum  
13 detection area and if you have got a wide lane you could  
14 have more detectors or a wider detector. And I think we can  
15 all pretty well agree on that.

16 And then there was the issue about whether we  
17 should show a formula or a table. There was a preference to  
18 the table. But if we don't have the table we at least have  
19 to have clarification on the formula.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: On the legend, on  
21 the legend. I think it's a good idea. Because it was my  
22 idea it's a good idea --

23 (Laughter.)

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: -- to add, to add  
25 the legend on the table. I would like to caution you,

1   except if you can calculate on maybe five feet increments  
2   and go all the way to 300 feet it's going to be a pretty  
3   long table. Because you really, it's going to be pretty  
4   difficult to foresee what is the widest possible W. But  
5   anyway, that is an option to look at.

6               But I agree with the gentleman who made the  
7   mention. I mean, the defense attorneys, they love this  
8   stuff. When they see a formula and there is room, you know.  
9   I have been to a few of those. Jim Hudson and I used to  
10  work in City of Orange together. We have had a few traffic  
11  accident investigations.

12              Okay. So Mr. Mansourian, if I hear you correctly  
13  -- by the way, the standards for the construction part, when  
14  the policy directive is issues, will apply only to the new  
15  signals or when you modify the signal. The timing part is  
16  going to go into effect for all the signals. So there is a  
17  distinction there also. So is that your suggestion,  
18  Mr. Mansourian, that we just go through these comments maybe  
19  one more time in a summary form and have Caltrans work the  
20  language?

21              COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I would suggest, I  
22  would Jeff and John point out the clarifications, and Robert  
23  if he has any, to specific, you know. And then if we all  
24  agree then that's our motion. But, you know, beginning page  
25  11, I believe, is where the subcommittee's proposal begins.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, so let's have  
2 it in the form of a motion so we can move this thing.  
3 Mr. Fisher, do you want to take the lead on making a motion  
4 outlining the recommendations and changes that you  
5 suggested.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I would like to  
7 move that the committee first give direction on whether we  
8 want the detection for a wide curb lane, across the width of  
9 the wide curb lane. And I think then if we can resolve  
10 that, then we can move on the other items. Would that be  
11 okay to do it that way?

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Absolutely.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So I move that we  
14 resolve that we want detection across the full width of a  
15 wide lane. And I will then suggest wording to that effect.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So there is a motion  
17 to define the detection area as wide as the lane may be.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Second.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
20 and a second. Discussion?

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I mean, just to  
22 get philosophical concurrence.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We can work on  
25 the words. But I think we need to resolve this



1 philosophical discussion, this philosophical issue first. I  
2 think as the --

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: God help us, a bunch  
4 of engineers discussing philosophy.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. But I  
6 respect what Mr. Shanteau has come up with indicating that  
7 we don't necessarily want them to ride next to the curb  
8 because they are going to get hooked by a right turn that  
9 turns not next to the curb but a little bit far from the  
10 curb. And I think I respect that. And I think education  
11 should help teach the more seasoned bicyclist to ride in  
12 that fashion.

13 But I think also because the vehicle code allows  
14 you to be next to the curb there are going to be some  
15 bicyclists who will exercise that right. And therefore I  
16 think the prudent thing to do is to make sure we detect all  
17 bicyclists if we have a curb lane of a certain width.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, there is a  
19 motion and second on the floor. Discussion? Mr. Knowles.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I was wondering if  
21 there is an alternative. The sticking point seems to be the  
22 six-by-six. What if we were just talking about the six foot  
23 area immediately behind the limit line? Because that is  
24 really where we are putting the detection and that way we  
25 are not mandating the detection go all the way across the

1 wide lane.

2 Because I may separate that into two separate  
3 detections. Using my video I may have the left section and  
4 the right section. Because the right section I want to  
5 apply some detection delay to, to allow for that right turn  
6 on red. It will detect the cyclist but there may be a 10 or  
7 20 second delay before it goes in. But the left section of  
8 the lane there would be no delay whatsoever.

9 So I wouldn't want to do a blanket statement I  
10 have to provide detection all the way across the lane. You  
11 know, what we are dealing with really is that six foot area  
12 immediately behind the limit line is where we need to  
13 provide this bicycle and motorcycle detection.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But as a  
15 practical matter, loops come in six foot increments.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Not videos. It's  
17 whatever you draw.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. For video  
19 you're correct, you can do it. If you are using conductive  
20 loop detectors they come in six foot increments.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Not if you do it  
22 lengthwise across the lane instead of depth.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, with the  
24 quadrapole design that we have there?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I just didn't want to

1 limit my ability in saying that I had to provide detection  
2 across the entire lane. Because I would treat a 20 or 22  
3 foot lane separately. I would probably do two separate --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Mr. Henley.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: My question on it. If  
6 we go all the way across that wide lane do we, you know,  
7 start sacrificing capacity for the right turners?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I think every time you  
10 have somebody making a right turn you are going to wind up  
11 going through a green cycle and it's probably not necessary.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, but it can  
13 cancel out. It can cancel out.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Oh, it can.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: If the right turn  
16 leaves then the call is dropped.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, there is a  
19 motion and a second on the floor.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Sorry, I have a  
21 quick question.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: What Jeff says and  
24 what John is suggesting, why can't we have both? I mean, I  
25 think if I read John's idea, the idea of being wide is so

1 everybody is detected. And Jeff is correct that I might not  
2 want to detect but he still wants to pick them up. So why  
3 can't be the language that either you pick them up or you  
4 have to be putting loop. You see what I'm -- I mean, we  
5 don't want -- the concept is to pick them up. How you do it  
6 -- so let's give them that choice.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It's up to the  
8 maker. We are just moving the process forward. It is up to  
9 the maker of the motion if he wants to amend his motion.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, I think we  
11 wanted to get general agreement on the concept.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So that's what I'm  
13 trying to get.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Before we got  
15 into the details.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's what I am  
17 trying to get.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So do we agree on  
19 the concept?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: The concept that we are  
21 trying to detect bicycles across the entire width of the  
22 lane.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Of a wide lane,  
24 yes.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So there is a motion

1 that the Committee supports the concept of detecting  
2 bicycles for the full width of the lane, on the curbside  
3 lane, regardless of the width of the lane. And there is a  
4 second on that. Do you want to work on that concept before  
5 we can move forward? All those in favor?

6 (Ayes.)

7 Opposition? Okay.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: What is the specific  
9 language?

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No, no, no, it's a  
11 concept.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It's a vote on  
13 the concept.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It's a concept, it's  
15 a concept, before we can move to the specifics. So the  
16 concept is approved, Mr. Fisher.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, all right.  
18 So let me --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Did everybody say yes?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, it was  
21 unanimous.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Now John has ten  
23 seconds to come up with --

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Now using the  
25 language --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We solved the  
2 philosophy part.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Now let's get to the  
5 engineering.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right. Now  
7 at the bottom of page 11 under definition 29A. The language  
8 that is there is that an approximate six-foot-by-six-foot  
9 area for a normal lane, okay. So you've got the word  
10 "approximate" and you've got the word "normal lane" okay.  
11 We are talking about a normal lane is generally in the range  
12 of 12 feet, 11 feet, whatever. And so what we are talking  
13 about is for a wide curb lane. That's not a normal lane,  
14 it's a wide curb lane.

15 So I would proposal that we keep the language that  
16 is already there but add a sentence that would say: For a  
17 lane width of 20 feet or greater, two six-foot-by-six-foot  
18 areas shall constitute the limit line detection zone. The  
19 reason for that is that these special loops come in six foot  
20 increments. Twenty feet is about the minimum width where  
21 you could fit another six foot loop in.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, let's -- There  
23 is no way we can get all this done in one motion. Let's  
24 move one paragraph maybe at a time. So your, let's make it  
25 in the form of a motion moving on. So you make a motion to

1 add that sentence to where, 29A, right?

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: To the end of  
3 29A.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: To the end of 29A on  
5 page 11.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion,  
8 is there a second.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Second.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
11 and second. Discussion on adding that sentence to the end.  
12 Mr. Knowles.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I guess because we are  
14 dealing with different technology and we wanted to be  
15 technology neutral. I still question the six-by-six simply  
16 because when we are drawing in video everything is  
17 approximate. We are not saying minimum, you know. I guess  
18 I am not clear because my typical detection zones, what we  
19 are drawing don't resemble anything six-by-six. We are  
20 drawing them, you know, standing in the field on a screen.  
21 They are not six-by-six.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: But it says,  
23 approximately six-by-six.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But I mean, if it's a  
25 minimum of it's something. But six-by-six. I have a hard

1 time with six -- what do I explain in court, you know. How  
2 exact do we need to be when we are drawing, you know,  
3 detection zones, the technician is drawing them in the  
4 field? We are getting detection. We are going to verify  
5 that we are getting detection. And we are going to  
6 customize that field to get the detection, you know. You  
7 know how with the variety that are out there. And for me,  
8 two six-by-sixes doesn't cut it.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: What if you use about  
10 six-by-six.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It already says,  
12 approximately.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: A minimum of six-by-  
14 six?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I didn't say minimum, I  
16 said about. It could be minimum, it could be approximate.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well ten-by-six is not  
18 about six-by-six.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well Jeff, is  
20 your issue resolved if we strike out the words "an  
21 approximate" and use "a minimum?"

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes. Okay. I will  
23 amend my motion for the first sentence to say, a minimum  
24 six-foot-by-six-foot area, blah-blah-blah.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay.



1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And then for the  
2 second sentence that I propose that we add --

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You want to read it  
4 one more time, please.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, so here is  
6 my amended motion for 29A. A minimum six-foot-by-six-foot  
7 area immediately behind the limit line, either centered in a  
8 normal lane width or approximately three feet from the left  
9 lane line if a right turn lane is more than 12 feet wide.  
10 For a lane width of 20 feet or greater --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's a new  
12 sentence.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, the new  
14 sentence. For a lane width of 20 feet or greater, two  
15 minimum six-foot-by-six-foot areas shall constitute the  
16 limit line detection zone.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Do you want  
18 to second that?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes, second.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, there is a new  
21 motion, second. Discussion on that one?

22 Seeing none do you want to vote? All those in  
23 favor of the motion say aye.

24 (Ayes.)

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

1 Passes unanimously.

2 Second one. On page 12 we have Item C under where  
3 it says vehicular right turns are either prohibited or not  
4 authorized. And you were wondering about the California  
5 Vehicle Code compliance. So does this resolve that issue  
6 now?

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, we have  
8 already determined that we will put detection in a wide lane  
9 to detect the bicycles. So I guess the issue is then do we  
10 want to allow a bicycle push button where we already have  
11 detection as an option? I heard from the guests in the room  
12 that some thought it was a good idea because --

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The reason I said,  
14 Mr. Fisher, this may be a non-issue now is because that was  
15 an issue when you were restricting the detection area to the  
16 left side of the lane.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Now that we are  
19 defining and expanding the detection area, so it's the  
20 matter of form of detection. It's either the loop or camera  
21 for video detection. And why not with the push button as an  
22 option. There is no harm in that one.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It seems like  
24 there is no harm but then I heard someone say that well, you  
25 are encouraging them to always stay to the right if you put

1 the push button there. Because that will be highly visible  
2 and then they will be inclined to stay to the right. So I  
3 am a little conflicted on this one.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes. Because the  
5 language the way it is now you have the option of putting  
6 the push button if the right turn is prohibited.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Otherwise you cannot  
9 put the push button there. Which is like 99.9 percent of  
10 intersections.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well I move then,  
12 since we resolved the issue of extending the detection  
13 across a wide lane, that we remove Item C.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You want to make a  
15 motion.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: John, I'm sorry,  
17 would you say which Item C.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sorry, near  
19 the bottom of page 12.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Are you under Option  
21 or under Guidance?

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Under Option.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Bicyclist push  
25 button may be used. And it says, where vehicular right

1 turns are either prohibited or not authorized. I'd move  
2 that we strike that language C.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion to  
4 strike language C on page 12. Is there a second?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'll second that and  
6 I want to ask Robert one more time to advise us. So I  
7 second it for discussion.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, for discussion  
9 purposes the motion and second. Chief.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Well, so what you are  
11 saying is -- the language as written says that you can only  
12 have a push button where right turns are prohibited or not  
13 authorized.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's the proposed  
15 language, yes.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: So if we strike that  
17 then we are saying that the push buttons can only be used  
18 for the first two.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: This is an option,  
20 it's not only. It just gives an option to the locals.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: The option is only  
22 where all the following apply.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So in other words  
24 you would be able to use it where right turns are allowed.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Oh, I see what you are

1 saying, right.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: In other words, when  
3 there is an option language it's the local discretion based  
4 on engineering judgment.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Well then I guess I'm  
6 confused, John, about -- I thought you were conflicted about  
7 having those highly visible where a right turn is  
8 authorized. I mean, technically, you know, technically they  
9 are allowed to be there. So if we have detection outside  
10 the push button then you probably wouldn't need the push  
11 button. But should the local engineer have the option of  
12 determining based on their best judgment that on a  
13 particular intersection they need it there. There is no  
14 conflict of the Vehicle Code having it there.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. I would  
16 argue that, now that I think about it, if you have a 16 foot  
17 lane, not quite wide enough to put in the two six-foot-by-  
18 six-foot detectors, you are going to have the right half of  
19 your lane undetected. Now you could argue then you want  
20 bicyclists then to take the lane. But some are not going to  
21 take the lane.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Right.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So I think the  
24 only option for them is to press the button. So that's why  
25 I would suggest removing Item C.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles, you had  
2 your hand up. Do you have something to add?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I guess first I would  
4 question. Is this language at all reflecting anything in  
5 the federal MUTCD. Because for me it works best if you put  
6 a period after "detection." "A bicyclist push button may be  
7 used to supplement the required limit line detection." And  
8 strike everything else.

9 Because it puts certain jurisdictions in jeopardy  
10 where based on engineering judgment they put that in. We  
11 are saying it's supplementing what we just defined as limit  
12 line detection. But we are saying you can only -- we are  
13 already telling this engineer, you can only use it in these  
14 cases. And exactly -- unless we are reflecting the federal  
15 MUTCD, why exactly based on the legislation, are we telling  
16 engineers they can only use it under these conditions. So I  
17 would recommend that we put a period after "detection" and  
18 strike the rest of it.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: What was that you  
20 were suggesting?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That this section for  
22 support. You know, when you get down to, a bicycle push  
23 button may be used to supplement the required limit line  
24 detection, period. And that you don't need the rest of the  
25 language.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So you are, so you  
2 are suggesting to get rid of that option altogether, right?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: You get rid of  
4 everything starting with, only where all. Get rid of A, B  
5 and C.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I think that makes a  
7 lot of sense.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Yes.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Because it leaves us  
10 room. And we don't need to start getting into specifics.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I would agree  
12 with that.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So you are  
14 withdrawing your motion?

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I am withdrawing  
16 my motion.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Or you are amending?  
18 Okay, let's --

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I will amend it.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: We have spent over an  
21 hour and a half on one item.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But remember, we have  
23 been discussing this for a long time. We are trying to get  
24 it resolved.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: On what Jeff has

1 said --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: We don't want to do it  
3 again.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's what I'm saying.  
5 It's better to give it to the committee and let them come  
6 back.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Babico, I really  
8 don't want to bring this issue back for a couple of reasons.  
9 we have spent a lot of time. And the second reason is that  
10 1581 is not going to kick in, it is not going to become  
11 effective until Caltrans issues a policy directive. And as  
12 Mr. Mansourian said, the construction season is starting and  
13 we want to have something out there.

14 Go ahead.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I would amend my  
16 motion just for the option to say a bicyclist push button  
17 may be used to supplement the required limit line detection,  
18 period. And eliminate the rest of that option.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Eliminate the rest  
20 of the sentence and A, B, C.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: All of it, that's  
23 the motion.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Second.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And a second.



1 Discussion? Hopefully not.

2 Okay, seeing none. All those voting yes, aye.

3 (Ayes.)

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

5 The second one passes also.

6 The third one. Mr. Fisher, you had a comment  
7 also, on top of page 13.

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Where it says, "the  
10 limit line detection not extend all the way to the edge." I  
11 think that issue is now resolved because we defined the  
12 detection zone.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: What about the bottom  
14 part of the guidance on 12? For example, we had that letter  
15 from the City of San Jose where they had this issue of using  
16 the phrase in the top line, have been. Exactly what do we  
17 mean when we say, if more than 50 percent of the limit line  
18 detectors have been, past tense. They are very concerned,  
19 and I think legitimately, that if it has -- It's almost like  
20 you are required to update the detection even though you  
21 updated it in the past. And I think that is a legitimate  
22 concern.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, didn't bring  
24 it up in the first round of discussion. So Mr. Knowles,  
25 would you please explain what you mean.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well basically if you  
2 strike "have been or" so that the sentence reads: If more  
3 than 50 percent of limit line detectors need to be replaced  
4 at a signalized intersection then the entire blah-blah-blah.  
5 It's just strike the words "have been or." That way it's  
6 all present tense.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, make it a  
8 motion, get a second and let's move on.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'm too new to make a  
10 motion.

11 (Laughter.)

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: This is going to be  
13 your first motion, we've got to celebrate. Go ahead.

14 (Laughter.)

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Drinks for everybody.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So is that in the  
17 form of a motion, Mr. Knowles?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I make the motion  
19 to approve the guidance as stated on page 12, absent the  
20 words "have been or", as stated in the first sentence.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, there's a  
22 motion. A second?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Second.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, I have a  
25 second from the Chief. All those in favor?

1 (Ayes.)

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

3 It passes with the language as recommended for  
4 deletion. Okay, now we go to 13.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay 13. The top  
6 of page 13 is support statements.

7 We already resolved that we want to extend the  
8 detection across a wide lane. So that would suggest that we  
9 delete the sentence that says -- Figure 40, 111-CA

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Accordingly.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: "Accordingly, the  
12 limit line detection zone need not extend all the way to the  
13 curb or edge of pavement."

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, you know the  
15 drill, make a motion.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I move that we  
17 delete that sentence.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion to  
19 delete on top of page 13 the sentence that starts with  
20 "Accordingly the limit line" all the way through. Second?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Second.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I have a motion and  
23 second. Anybody opposing?

24 Seeing none the motion passes unanimously.

25 Okay, what was your next one?

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The very next  
2 sentence, sentence of the next paragraph. Again keep in  
3 mind this is a support statement. It says: "A bicyclist  
4 push button is only allowed as a supplement" because we have  
5 already determined that it will be an option.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So I move that we  
8 eliminate, that we delete this sentence and we editorially  
9 restructure A, B and C below so that it is just a continuous  
10 paragraph. In other words, delete the letters A, B and C  
11 and just keep that as a paragraph in that it is a support  
12 statement.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So your motion is to  
14 delete the heading sentence and then do not numerate A, B,  
15 C.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just put it in a  
18 paragraph format.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion.  
21 A second? We have no second. There is a motion, is there a  
22 second?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll second it.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
25 and a second. Discussion?

1           You want to vote? All those in favor say --

2           COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Discussion.

3           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Oh, delayed.

4   Mr. Knowles, discussion.

5           COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I guess in light of the  
6 fact that we allowed the traffic engineer to supplement  
7 detection with a button. When I read this push button, when  
8 I read this new paragraph then it seems -- you know, the  
9 substitution for A, B and C. It only includes all the  
10 reasons not to put in a button and seems like it creates a  
11 tremendous liability for the individual that just installed  
12 the button.

13          COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I think you need to  
14 -- because of our previous motion I think we need to  
15 eliminate this whole thing.

16          COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I would agree.

17          COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The sentence and A,  
18 B, C.

19          COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

20          COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: We already dealt  
21 with that. It's up to the local to decide if they want to  
22 do it, period.

23          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, this time I am  
24 not going to give you the benefit.

25          COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So I'll make the

1 motion that --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Your motion failed,  
3 let's make another motion.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Wait, no.  
5 (Laughter.)

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I second the motion.  
7 We're making the argument against the previous action in  
8 this.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sorry, did I,  
10 was it my motion.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You win some, lose  
12 some, okay. Go ahead.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I will, I move to  
14 amend my motion.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That would  
17 eliminate the lead section.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The whole section.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I guess the whole  
20 section, right. One of the problems is it's hard to edit  
21 all this on the fly like we're doing but I recognize that we  
22 need to do so to get something out.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We have to keep this  
24 thing moving.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We don't want to  
2 send it back to subcommittee.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So is your motion  
4 from the "bicyclist push button" all the way to where it  
5 says "guidance?" Is that what you are recommending? We are  
6 deleting that whole thing, right?

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The sentence, A, B,  
9 C.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, the whole  
11 paragraph.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The last sentence is  
13 still applicable.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, no, he means A,  
15 B, C.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Only A, B, C.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Not the last line.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Did anybody  
20 second the motion?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Second.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
23 and second. Discussion?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'm charging you for  
25 all these seconds.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Seeing none, all  
2 those in favor say aye.

3 (Ayes.)

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

5 Okay, the motion passes unanimously.

6 I am not going to make my suggestion for the  
7 legend, you guys do that editorially. Just add the legend  
8 under the formula so we know the parameters. Okay.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And editorially  
10 change "greater" to be "greater than or equal to."

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: At the end we will  
12 have a uniform, comprehensive motion.

13 Okay, moving on, on page 14.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So I guess I don't  
15 understand the way you are dividing up the discussions  
16 because guidance seemed like there are major issues on page  
17 13 with regards to signal timing. What we just approved  
18 was --

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay so let's stop,  
20 let's go back to page 13. Okay, page 13 we go under  
21 Guidance. Is the issue of timing. And I think Mr. Knowles  
22 led the discussion on that one. Jeff, you want to --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: My big concern here is  
24 -- remember, this isn't just convenience. This is air  
25 quality management, this is automotive emissions, fuel



1 usage, all those kinds of things when we increase congestion  
2 at these intersections because of lengthening basically the  
3 green time for minor movements at the expense of green time  
4 for the main street. That's typically what the impact will  
5 be. Because the main street crossing a minor street, the  
6 existing signal timing handles these clearance intervals.  
7 But a minor side street crossing a main street, the effect  
8 would be reducing the green time and less congestion on the  
9 main street. Because the minor street has a long distance  
10 to traverse.

11           So number one. In most cases, although the  
12 existing MUTCD has text, we almost always have tables in  
13 these types of instances. And number two, when I read the  
14 legislation it's very vague. It emphasizes detection,  
15 detection, detection, detection. It makes reference to "and  
16 related signal timing." But isn't that with regards to  
17 detection, detection, detection. So I oppose the language  
18 in Guidance.

19           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Are you opposing the  
20 whole concept of introducing a section for timing associated  
21 with bicycles at signals or are you opposing this specific  
22 language?

23           COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I strongly recommend  
24 that we approve language for putting in detection and that  
25 the issue of timing needs to come back at a later time with

1 a table and with some discussion about the impact on traffic  
2 operations in general. Because with the large suburban  
3 communities I work for with huge arterial roadways, the  
4 impact this would have on maintaining levels of service, of  
5 traffic progression down the street, we're talking signal  
6 coordination, is just huge. If all of a sudden --

7 I mean, I already have trouble with pedestrians  
8 crossing these wide streets and the way I dealt with signal  
9 timing. But if now for every signal I have got to increase  
10 my minimum green times to acceptable levels, that makes  
11 progression on two way arterials very difficult.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You made your point  
13 and now you have experience, you are ready for your second  
14 motion. So is that your motion, to delete that language  
15 related to guidance altogether?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes. Yes. At this  
17 time.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I have a motion to  
19 delete the language related to timing at this time and come  
20 back with additional information later under Guidance. Is  
21 there a second to the motion?

22 Seeing no second the motion dies. Okay, let's  
23 move on.

24 So how do you want to approach this? The issue is  
25 just not to make it overly complicated. It has

1 consequences, I mean, let's not fool ourselves. Regardless  
2 of whatever happens to the formula, and you do a table, you  
3 don't do a table. You do 14.7, you do 14.5. Whatever you  
4 do in terms of speed and all that. The consequences is that  
5 the signalized intersections, now you have to adjust your  
6 minimum greens. Otherwise the next bicyclist that has an  
7 accident, you have a lawsuit on your hands. And that is the  
8 intent of the state Legislature. So now we can play around  
9 with the language.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Mr. Chairman?

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, Mr. Babico.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I recall that Jeff  
13 expressed his concerns about this and there were some  
14 comments in response to his comments from the floor by the  
15 committee members as well as the guest members. So I wonder  
16 if we can just open it to the public, to those whom they  
17 concern, those members of the committee and the visitors,  
18 especially from the City of LA, how do they feel about the  
19 motion that Jeff made or how they are going to approach  
20 this, his comments regarding the signal timing. Rather than  
21 just closing because it didn't have a second motion.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. I have closed  
23 to public comments, I am not going to open to the public.  
24 But Caltrans staff and consultants to the Bicycle Committee,  
25 they are welcome to address the issue. As for the City of

1 LA, we have Mr. Fisher here and he can speak for the City of  
2 Los Angeles. But the point is what are we asking them.  
3 What is the question?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well whatever the motion  
5 was.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The motion, the  
7 concern is that this language would force municipalities to  
8 increase the minimum green on all their signals. And that  
9 fact is unavoidable. I mean, you can go and prepare new  
10 language and you can put in a new table and do calculations  
11 and do all kinds of things. But if you adopt a guidance in  
12 the California MUTCD that says that your signals must  
13 accommodate safe movement of a bicycle, when you don't have  
14 a bicycle detection, whether there is bicycle traffic on  
15 that road or not, then it is going to affect all your  
16 signals.

17 And there was a suggestion by Mr. Mansourian that  
18 there may be an exception made there, you know, for rural  
19 counties and things like --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, no, no, I wasn't  
21 saying that. I was saying because that creates a  
22 congestion.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Because it creates  
24 congestion.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Then that encourages

1 us to detect the bicyclists.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Which is the intent  
4 of the legislators.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, go ahead,  
6 Mr. Fisher.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I was just going  
8 to say I think we all feel a little bit of discomfort in  
9 providing green times that are not efficient in the absence  
10 of a bicyclist. But I think this is going to occur over a  
11 long period of time. It only applies when we are modifying  
12 our intersection anyway.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Not the timing.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: This is instant.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, you've got  
16 to have the detector there to detect the bicyclist.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: If you don't have a  
18 detector you have to have a minimum green to provide safe  
19 movement for the bicycle because the bicycle was not  
20 detected.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: There is nothing in  
22 this saying at new intersections or upgraded intersections.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It just says, signal  
24 timing.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: This is just saying

1 signal timing, period. This is, all my coordination goes  
2 out the window.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's why the  
4 implications of timing are more far-reaching the implication  
5 of detection.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Excuse me, I'm  
7 having a hard time hearing us. Would you guys, if you need  
8 to talk please go outside.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: LA City folks, they  
10 always looking to make noise.

11 Okay, if we are not going anywhere on this thing  
12 let's move on, I'll come back to this issue. I want to get  
13 all the detection issues resolved so we come back to the  
14 timing later.

15 Let's go back to page 14 again. Is there any  
16 comment on the diagrams, page 14 and 15 and 16?

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, I propose  
18 some changes on the diagram on page 14. It would be on the  
19 left display. That's labeled: "A intersection with a wide  
20 ride-through lane." I propose that it be modified to show  
21 the bicycle push button as labeled "optional" rather than  
22 crossed out. I propose that the curb lane width be labeled  
23 as "greater than or equal to 20 feet." And therefore  
24 propose that we show another six foot detector there.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, so three. So

1 the cross out on the bicycle option sign is going to be  
2 deleted, we put "optional" on the top.

3 We are going to show the lane width of 20 feet.  
4 The number, one, two, three -- the number three lane 20 feet  
5 or wider and show a second detector there.

6 And what was the other one?

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Label it  
8 "optional" for the push button.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Label it "optional."

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So that's your  
12 motion.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Is there a second?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll second it.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: A motion and second.  
17 Discussion?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I had one comment.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I was wondering if we  
21 could change the language a bit. In basically the old  
22 number one strikeout -- I mean, does it work if we refer to  
23 it as instead of to activate the traffic signal, referring  
24 to it as supplementing the required detection. That way we  
25 really don't show it as an option. We are consistent with

1 the rest of the language where this is not an option for  
2 detection but it is an option to supplement the other  
3 required detection.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I see Jim is  
5 nodding, it's good enough for me. Okay, you want to add it  
6 to your motion?

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I didn't  
8 understand what you said, I'm sorry.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Jeff, you want to  
10 explain.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You're talking  
12 about the footnotes?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The old comment number  
14 one, the old footnote to that push button.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Used to refer to it as  
17 you could use this as an option to activate the signal. And  
18 we are not really saying that. We are saying all the  
19 language that used to be in the old struck out sentence.  
20 But instead of to activate it is to supplement the required  
21 vehicle detection. A push button should be located, you  
22 know, where it is convenient to the bicyclist, blah-blah-  
23 blah. So all I am doing is striking out activate a traffic  
24 signal to supplement the required detection.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But that language



1 is struck out.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I would restore that to  
3 explain why that is an option.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: He wants to  
5 reinstate it.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Because it is really an  
7 option to supplement, it is not an optional form of  
8 detection.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But if we are  
10 showing the additional detector and we are labeling the push  
11 button as optional doesn't that accomplish the same thing?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well to me I guess an  
13 option is not a supplement in my mind, it's an option. And  
14 I'd rather -- it's supplementing. It's not taking the place  
15 of any detection we're showing, it's supplementing the  
16 detection. And to me that gets the distinction. Because  
17 previously in the text we referred to it as supplementing  
18 and we allowed the engineers discretion on its use. We have  
19 never before really called that an option.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I thought in the  
21 text we said that -- where was it? Going back to page, in  
22 page 12 we said a bicyclist push button may be used as an  
23 option. Under the title, Option: "A bicyclist push button  
24 may be used to supplement the required limit line  
25 detection." That was under the Option section.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. I would have  
2 just preferred it referred to as supplementing the required  
3 detection.

4 Are you proposing any text to go with undeleting  
5 it as an option? You're restoring -- You're proposing to  
6 not delete it. Is there any text that goes with the  
7 restored symbol?

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, it would say  
9 below it, optional.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I would just recommend  
11 using the word "supplement" within the sentence so that it's  
12 very clear to, you know, engineers in small agencies that  
13 it's only supplementing.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So your suggestion  
15 is to delete the strike-through and reinstate that number  
16 one sentence, right?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And then add  
19 "supplement" okay. Do you want to include it in your motion  
20 or do you disagree?

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I don't, I  
22 personally don't see the need for it, therefore I won't  
23 amend my motion. I respect the consensus of the group.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: All right, so let  
25 the motion fly and see how it goes.

1           There's a motion and a second and we have had some  
2 discussion. All those in favor say aye.

3           (Ayes.)

4           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

5           Seeing none the motion passes unanimously.

6           COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Just adding "optional"  
7 to the push button and adding second --

8           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And adding second.  
9 And putting greater than or equal to 20 feet to number  
10 three, curbside length. Those three. This is for the  
11 figure on page 14.

12           Do you have any comments on page 15 or 16,  
13 anybody?

14           COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I have a comment on  
15 page 16.

16           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, let's --  
17 before we go to 16. Anybody, comments on page 15?

18           Seeing none let's go to page 16. You wanted to  
19 add "optional" there.

20           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, optional to  
21 the push buttons on the left diagram and the right diagram.  
22 And then that we delete footnote four.

23           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So there is a motion  
24 to add "optional" to the two push buttons shown on the  
25 right, the exclusive right turn lane, the protected right

1 turn lane. Add "optional" on those two islands. And then  
2 delete footnote number four on page 16.

3 Is there a second for the motion?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Second.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
6 and a second. Discussion? Mr. Knowles.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes. I would suggest  
8 instead of deleting number four that again we put a period  
9 after "the required limit line detection" and then just  
10 delete the rest of the text. That way we are making the  
11 statement, "typical bicyclist push button locations, a  
12 bicycle push button may be used to supplement" blah-blah-  
13 blah. Limit line detection, period.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So you are saying  
15 keep number four but put a period at the end of where it  
16 says "the required limit line detection."

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Second line.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And then strike the  
20 rest of it.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And delete the rest  
22 of it. Is that okay with you, Mr. Fisher?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: If you want it that  
24 would be okay with me as long as we then put that same  
25 language on page 14.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Makes sense. Okay,  
2 so make it -- you want to make a motion to do the optional  
3 on page 14 for the two push buttons in the island. And  
4 number four, put a period at the end of "limit line  
5 deletion." Delete the rest of the paragraph. And take the  
6 same language as footnote number four, add it to page 14.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Is that your motion?

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I amend my  
10 motion.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Is there a second?  
12 Deborah, Ms. Wong?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Yes.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
15 and a second. Discussion?

16 Seeing none the motion passes unanimously.

17 Okay, so we are done with the detection side of it  
18 altogether.

19 Let's go back to page 13, the issue of the  
20 guidance, the issue of timing. That's back to philosophy  
21 again, you know. So that's the issue. No matter what you  
22 do with it, it's going to start affecting minimum green for  
23 traffic signals in California. Now we may have our thousand  
24 suggestions for doing things differently in terms of table  
25 or whatever. But maybe taking the lead from Mr. Fisher's

1 suggestion for the detection side let's look at the  
2 philosophy side of it.

3 Do you want to even go there? And maybe I should  
4 ask Caltrans. your interpretation of 1581. Does 1581  
5 definitely require standards for timing also or is it only  
6 talking about detection?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: My interpretation, it  
8 requires timing also.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Timing also.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And the thing is that we  
11 are talking about safety here essentially. We don't want to  
12 catch some bicycle out there in the middle of the road and  
13 getting whacked. I think we need to leave it there. And  
14 then, let's face it, it's going to create a market for some  
15 technology to, you know, get rid of the ambiguity of who is  
16 trying to cross the road but I think that's downstream.  
17 It's not something we are going to solve today or even next  
18 week.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Mr. Chairman?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: My interpretation  
22 of this, although I don't see all the words that say that.  
23 But my interpretation of this is that the timing has to be  
24 in place at such time that the detection is in place. How  
25 can you provide a minimum -- I think you would have to

1 provide this timing when you have got the detection there to  
2 know you have a bicyclist there. So I would think that  
3 would be the activation for the timing is putting the  
4 detection in place.

5 And actually the words don't say that, it just  
6 says, the signal timing shall be this. But I think we need  
7 to preface it by saying, when limit line detection zone has  
8 been provided the signal timing blah-blah-blah for all  
9 phases shall be as per the formula.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: See, the problem on  
11 reading the actual text. It says -- on D it says, upon the  
12 first placement of a traffic actuated signal or replacement  
13 of the loop detector of a traffic signal. The traffic  
14 actuated shall to extend feasible blah-blah-blah detect for  
15 motorcycle and bicycle. So on that one I'm clear.

16 But then you go to Item C. It says cities -- I'm  
17 reading page six and seven on the agenda. It's the actual  
18 text of 1581. It says cities and counties shall not be  
19 required to comply with the provisions until the Department  
20 has adopted this, okay. But then it says "related signal  
21 timing." I'm not an attorney, you may be right. It might  
22 be related signal timing to the signals that you modify.  
23 You can go argue that in a court. But my read is that it  
24 says "related signal timing." It means that the  
25 intersections that you modify. But who knows. Some judge

1 will decide some day.

2 So you can put it in Guidance. You can add the  
3 language that says that the guidance applies to the  
4 intersections where the requirements of 1581 have been  
5 applied. Is that going to address your concerns,  
6 Mr. Knowles.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'm just thinking about  
8 all my split phase intersections or the minor street. It  
9 has a double-whammy. You know, this is only getting worse.

10 No. I mean, I think when you're dealing with  
11 detection, detection has got to deal with gap timing, call  
12 hold, call hold. But, you know, min green is really not a  
13 detection function, you know. All-red, yellow is not a  
14 detection function. I think the legislation really doesn't  
15 refer to the kinds of things that we are monkeying with here  
16 and it's a real problem.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, let me ask.  
18 Let me stop this and let me ask Mr. Shanteau back and the  
19 gentleman from Caltrans.

20 MR. GAMBOA: Dave Gamboa.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Dave, sorry. Let's  
22 move this thing around.

23 MR. GAMBOA: Yes.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And Mr. Shanteau  
25 also has been very involved.



1           It seems that the committee has consensus to move  
2   the detection part of it forward. It seems that the timing  
3   issue may need a little bit more work.

4           Do you prefer to hold this one up or do you prefer  
5   that we do a motion, recommend to Caltrans to adopt the  
6   detection language, take the guidance section on page 13,  
7   work with your group, work with whoever else in this  
8   committee might be interested, and come back at a later  
9   time. So that at least the detection part is not delayed  
10  and makes it to the California MUTCD in time?

11           MR. GAMBOA: I would say the prevailing thought is  
12  we would go forward. The language that we have for the  
13  detection, it reflects what the law is asking for. I know  
14  that Mr. Knowles has some concerns regarding the practices  
15  portion of that. There is a, there is a technology lag. We  
16  don't have smart detectors that can distinguish. And maybe  
17  it would be incumbent on us to start work in that area.

18           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, understood. I  
19  don't think we are going to have the votes to pass the  
20  signal timing language part of it. But I don't want to hold  
21  this, to say to -- let me finish my thought. We may make a  
22  motion and move it. But before I want us to get their --

23           COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: But they are our  
24  subcommittee.

25           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes but they are the

1 people who are very much interested in implementing 1581,  
2 the bicycle advocacy.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The problem is, how  
4 can -- I mean, we have already made that decision,  
5 Mr. Chairman. That's why we put the timing in it.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: We already had that  
8 discussion. We said, without timing this is actually  
9 endangering bicyclists. That we are now picking them up.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: And then we are not  
12 going to have any timing for them to safely get across.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Let me hear  
14 from Mr. Shanteau a couple of words also.

15 DR. SHANTEAU: That's correct. That's why -- You  
16 remember, I didn't show up in Lincoln, your last meeting.  
17 Because I realized we made a huge mistake in that we did not  
18 include signal timing in our recommendation for the Lincoln  
19 meeting, your last meeting. And I realized without signal  
20 timing we have nothing.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, I have heard  
22 enough, thank you. Okay.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Mr. Chairman, here  
24 is my --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, so is that a

1 motion on the remaining part?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I don't think we  
3 have an issue with the timing and here is why. Every  
4 comment that has been made, which is good comments, talks  
5 about the difficulties and the congestion that this proposed  
6 timing will propose -- will create. They're right, there is  
7 absolutely no debate. The problem is the state legislators  
8 have passed an Assembly Bill and are telling us to do this.  
9 So this is one of the issues we have. So not doing it is  
10 not an option.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So you are ready to  
12 make a motion to adopt the rest of the language?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes, I'm fine. I  
14 think we have covered with everything. And we might not be  
15 happy with this particular timing. The subcommittee can  
16 come back with further recommendations in the future but I  
17 think we need to move on.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. I need a  
19 final motion that somebody says adopt the language as  
20 proposed with the amendments as moved through the different  
21 motions that we had. Is there a motion to that effect?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: John, have we  
23 covered all your issues yet?

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Since we are now  
25 concentrating on timing, and I believe we do need to move

1 forward with that. I was just going to add a sentence to  
2 that.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: What page, please.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: On page 13. That  
5 would tie in the requirement for timing with the detection.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, what's the  
7 sentence.

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So it would be  
9 under Guidance and it would precede the words that say  
10 "signal timing:" And the words would be, "Where limit line  
11 detection has been provided, signal timing should be  
12 provided as follows." And then strike the words "signal  
13 timing" and then proceed with the rest that says --

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: "For all phases  
16 the sum of the minimum" blah-blah-blah.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, so it will  
18 restrict the timing requirement only to the signals that  
19 have been modified for detection.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Second.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's your  
22 suggestion.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So there is a  
25 motion. With the adding of that sentence the timing will be

1 restricted only to the intersections that have been modified  
2 for detection.

3 And there is a second. Is there discussion?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I would say you would  
7 need to be more specific that you are talking about signals  
8 that have been modified to include the bicycle detection as  
9 described in the section. Because many signals have limit  
10 line detection right now that isn't compatible with  
11 bicycles. And the language as proposed would affect those  
12 too based on what I heard.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You can --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Secondly, I would want  
15 some -- is that the only part of the language proposed right  
16 now? We are not getting into the specifics of the formula  
17 or the values that we are talking about? Just that?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It's just that  
19 sentence. Just a clarification.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. It says:  
21 "Where a limit line detection zone has been provided then  
22 the signal timing shall be provided as follows."

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: See, most of my signals  
24 have limit line detection zones but we haven't  
25 implemented --

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: No, no, you don't  
2 a have limit line detection zone as defined here.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You can add -- Just  
4 say, you can say, for intersections that have limit line  
5 detection as explained in Section 29A of this code.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes, please. Because  
7 all of my signals have limit line detection. Not this kind.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So that it says it  
9 is only applying for this section. If you do that it is  
10 going to take care of his concern. Are you willing to amend  
11 your motion?

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Hold on a second.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: If you say for the  
14 intersections that have limit line detection as defined by  
15 Section 29A of California MUTCD. Which means that only the  
16 intersections that are modified per this section of the  
17 Code. Then that restricts it only to those intersections.

18 DR. SHANTEAU: Can I suggest?

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, I think we  
20 may need --

21 DR. SHANTEAU: Just capitalize limit line  
22 detection zone in your motion.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, that solves it  
25 also. For further clarity you can refer to the section of

1 the Code if you want, it's your motion.

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I want to finish  
4 this item in the next few minutes.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. And I  
6 guess the only thing I'm struggling with, Jeff said his  
7 limit line, limit line detection zone doesn't make reference  
8 to the referenced bicycle rider.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. See, I already  
10 have 29A at all of my signals, you know. This is our basic  
11 loop layout. But I won't be able to provide bicycle  
12 detection.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So if we consider  
14 this, amending my motion to say, where limit line detection  
15 zone that can detect the referenced bicycle rider has been  
16 provided, signal timing should be provided as follows. Will  
17 that do it?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion.  
20 Is there a second?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Second.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
23 and a second. Is there discussion?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: On that phrase? We are  
25 just talking about that. Not the whole sentence but that

1 phrase, right?

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right, just  
3 adding that.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That phrase.

5 Okay, all those in favor?

6 (Ayes.)

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition? That  
8 phrase is added as crafted by Mr. Fisher, as suggested in  
9 his motion.

10 Okay, is there any other discussion on the rest of  
11 the Code? Or this is ready for -- Because I need a final  
12 motion to approve the whole thing, including these motions  
13 that we have been making.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I --

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I move that we --  
16 well go ahead, Jeff.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: If I could ask a  
18 question of the Committee, though. In what cases have we  
19 ever used green time as a clearance interval? Even yellow  
20 is not a clearance interval. It is just advising people  
21 that the green -- you know, yellow equals green. We use  
22 this all the time in talking about pedestrian clearance when  
23 they say the Walk isn't long enough. That even up to and  
24 through the yellow cyclists can enter the intersection.

25 There is a basic flaw that says you can use yellow



1 and minimum green to try to clear any vehicle all the way  
2 through the intersection. It just doesn't work. Legally  
3 the bicycle can enter on yellow and all he's got is whatever  
4 is left of the yellow and the all-red clearance. And they  
5 are not going to clear a wide intersection. But the intent  
6 is to use green as a clearance interval and it is not.

7           You know, for people who operate signals I just  
8 don't understand the concept of designing minimum green so  
9 they can clear the full intersection. We just don't do that  
10 and California law doesn't require it. Any car on a green  
11 has to yield to any vehicle already in the intersection  
12 legally.

13           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well it didn't  
14 say it's a clearance interval. It just says to clear the  
15 last conflicting light.

16           COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But the formula uses  
17 green as part of the clearance formula. I mean, it is being  
18 calculated as a start-up and clearance.

19           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, it is adding  
20 green plus yellow plus red clearance. They are treating  
21 bicycles different than vehicles when it comes to --

22           COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. The legislation  
23 refers to conformance with professional engineering  
24 practices. What we would be doing here is not consistent  
25 with what we do with any other professional practice as it

1 reflects vehicles on the roadway.

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So what do you  
3 recommend?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It goes back to the  
5 committee. I want a table that Caltrans really approves  
6 that they are going to use on Hawthorne Boulevard, the  
7 really wide state routes.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, you know what.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I want to see this.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I thought we don't,  
11 I thought we don't have a vote on this but some members felt  
12 we do. I have a motion and I have a second to approve the  
13 language as presented with the amendments so far and I have  
14 a second. Is there a discussion? And you made your point  
15 and let's -- if anybody else has points. Mr. Babico?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Chief? Mr. Henley?  
18 Anybody? Okay, let's vote on the motion. All those in  
19 favor say aye.

20 (Ayes.)

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The motion passes  
24 one-seven. Seven-to-one, not one-seven. One-seven we fail.  
25 Motion passes seven-to-one.

1           It's the end of 1581, thank you very much for your  
2   patience. Thank you. I mentioned it before, Mr. Shanteau,  
3   Jim, all the members of the subcommittee, the folks from LA,  
4   from Long Beach back there. There was another city, who was  
5   there?

6           DR. SHANTEAU: San Francisco.

7           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: San Francisco.

8   Since they are not here I am not going to thank them.

9           DR. SHANTEAU: The City and County.

10          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I am not going to  
11   thank them, they are not here. No, no, thanking everybody.  
12   You guys did -- it took about a year to come up with this,  
13   thank you very much.

14          And it is now in Caltrans' ball -- court to issue  
15   the policy directive. As soon as the policy directive is  
16   issued 1581 kicks in for the cities and the counties.  
17   Congratulations.

18          Do you want to break for ten minutes or do you  
19   want to keep going?

20          (Affirmative responses.)

21          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. But please,  
22   we have a long agenda. Please be back in ten minutes. Ten  
23   minutes maximum.

24          (Thereupon, a recess was taken off the  
25   record.)

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Let's call the  
2 meeting back to order, thank you very much.

3 When we went through introductions I noticed a lot  
4 of people are here for item 09-10, which is the Section  
5 2B.13 for the speed limit issue. So let's pick that item  
6 first so that people don't have to wait too long. And there  
7 are people on other items also and my apologies. If we  
8 don't mind we get that quickly done.

9 Just a brief introduction. We have been dealing  
10 with this issue for almost two years now. We have had a  
11 special meeting, we have had workshops, we have had  
12 subcommittees, we have had all kinds of things. And finally  
13 there was a special meeting -- When was it?

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: March 19.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: March 19 in  
16 Sacramento. The Director of Caltrans and the CHP  
17 Commissioner were in attendance among many other people,  
18 some are here.

19 And there was a recommendation -- there was a  
20 motion that did not pass. There is a standing  
21 recommendation by the Devices Committee to the Caltrans  
22 Director. However, the way that it operates is that we are  
23 an advisory committee and the ultimate decision is made by  
24 the Director of Caltrans. And in this case the Caltrans  
25 Director has made the decision. Mr. Kempton and his

1 representative, Mr. Copp, will present that to the  
2 Committee.

3 Just a point of clarification. This issue is not  
4 up for debate and discussion on a policy. Mr. Kempton has  
5 already made the policy decision. Whether you agree with it  
6 or not, that's it, we each have our own views, but the  
7 policy decision is made.

8 The presentations will be limited to the clarity  
9 on text. If there are contradictions or if there are  
10 additional clarifications that need to be done. And there  
11 is one issue that will be clarified further and Mr. Copp is  
12 going to discuss that.

13 Mr. Henley, you are presenting or Mr. Copp?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Mr. Copp.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Copp. But when  
16 we get into the debate and discussion please do not reopen  
17 the whole concept. We have done that for two years. The  
18 decision on the policy approach has already been made.

19 Mr. Copp.

20 MR. COPP: Thank you, thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm  
21 Robert Copp. I am the chief of the Division of Traffic  
22 Operations for Caltrans.

23 With that introduction that the Chair made I just  
24 want to say that I realize that this has been a very  
25 frustrating and long process and it is not something that

1 the Department wants to see happen. And we know that  
2 sometimes the work, the hard work is needed to really work  
3 through something and get there.

4 I just saw the work that you just did with the  
5 bicycle detection and I want to recognize the effort it took  
6 to do that. The large effort of the Committee and the fact  
7 that all of you chose to sit through that and work through  
8 every item. And I know it's not perfect but it's moving  
9 forward.

10 And that is how the Director feels about this  
11 issue. He really took this strongly under advisement. I  
12 want to make sure there is no confusion about this. That he  
13 took a lot of input. We got lots of letters before and  
14 after he put out his decision and we have got binders of  
15 stuff that we have summarized for him. We have a wide  
16 variety of people who wanted a soft floor; we have a wide  
17 variety of people who wanted a hard floor. We had all sorts  
18 of complex alternatives that we provided to him that he just  
19 said, way too complex, forget that.

20 Then it struck him as he was talking to people  
21 that he was seeing over and over again, why don't we just go  
22 back to the way it was. You know, maybe we have looked at  
23 every way we can and there is no new way we can go. So his  
24 decision was to go back to the way it was before -- I want  
25 to get this right. Before 2004. Which is the round to the

1 nearest and then you can drop an additional five miles an  
2 hour within your study or engineering traffic survey. So  
3 that is the way it was before, that is his proposal to go  
4 back to that.

5 He made several modifications to that. Some non-  
6 controversial, some controversial. One of them was that a  
7 registered engineer approve that. And there's some  
8 terminology issues we have to develop to make that clear  
9 what that means. I've heard from a lot of people about that  
10 one.

11 There's also the issue of concurrence by the  
12 enforcement agency. We are going to talk about that in a  
13 minute some more.

14 And the other one was an education program where  
15 Caltrans would put together education for engineers, for  
16 enforcement personnel and for the judiciary. One of the  
17 Director's big points was he was concerned that judges would  
18 turn these things over. He wanted their input. However, in  
19 our discussions with the Judicial Council of California they  
20 let it be known it would be a conflict of interest for them  
21 to speak up. However, they welcomed the training. And so  
22 we will be putting together educational classes.

23 And that was really, he was after trying to make  
24 sure we all understand no matter what point of view you  
25 might have. Whether you are the engineer who is doing the

1 work on it or whether you are the enforcement personnel that  
2 is enforcing it or whether you are a judge that is deciding,  
3 you need to understand why we did this and what the  
4 background is for it.

5 So with that background we, I personally made  
6 calls to each member of the committee, got their feedback as  
7 well as what they have heard from people who called them.  
8 Of course we were getting things ourselves.

9 I then spent some time with the director and asked  
10 him, you know, how do we best make this work. So here is  
11 the two-phase approach. The first phase is we will have the  
12 regulation written and prepared and into the California  
13 MUTCD by July 1st. So today he makes the decision and then  
14 we do the work of the wordsmithing to make it clear.  
15 Because I know that the summary that he gave, it has some  
16 areas for clarity.

17 Then the second part was after hearing a wide  
18 variety of people speak to it, especially from county  
19 representatives that the concurrence issue was a problem for  
20 them. He is willing to let us put together a small  
21 subcommittee to quickly address that issue. Where by the  
22 middle of June we would have a decision as to different  
23 wording that might work in that area.

24 Again, his bias was just to bring people together.  
25 To make sure we are working together and make sure there is



1 no conflict out there. Since the concern was raised he is  
2 willing to let a small group do that as long as they act  
3 quickly and that we move forward with this as planned on  
4 July 1st.

5 So I think I've pretty much covered the background  
6 unless there's questions.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you, Mr. Copp.  
8 Just a point of clarification. You are going back to what  
9 we adopted in 2004, not what we had before 2004.

10 MR. COPP: Okay, all right, thank you. Thank you  
11 for the clarification.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Because before 2004  
13 it was written and in 2004 adoption.

14 MR. COPP: Okay, thank you.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So it's the language  
16 that was adopted in '04, not before.

17 MR. COPP: Thank you.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just for the record  
19 and for the audience.

20 Thank you very much. I have been working with  
21 Mr. Copp. We have had a couple of conversations with  
22 Director Kempton, we had a couple of meetings with him. So  
23 that's where we are.

24 Members, let's do this in order. I'll start with  
25 Ms. Wong, if she has any questions for Mr. Copp or

1 suggestions.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: No.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Mansourian.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No. Again, Mr. Copp  
5 talked about that the counties were very pleased that  
6 Director Kempton listened to us and understood our issue and  
7 has agreed to this small subcommittee. I will coordinate  
8 such a very small subcommittee on that very focused issue  
9 with Robert Copp and with CHP Commissioner and whoever else  
10 that Robert thinks needs to be included.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Chief Maynard.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'm sorry?

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Chief Maynard.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'm saying the CHP  
15 Commissioner because that's who the Director said he wants  
16 to be. Or his representative, I'm sure, Chief Maynard. But  
17 the idea is to only work on that piece and do it soon. I  
18 mean, like ASAP. So we are going to be working on that.  
19 Everything else it is decided and it is what it is.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Because the  
21 natives are getting pretty restless. So July 1st we will  
22 have the new policy directive, right?

23 MR. COPP: Right.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I promised the  
25 Director that this subcommittee will meet and will be done

1 no later than the middle of June. My goal is frankly much  
2 sooner than that.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Robert.  
5 Just a couple of comments just for your consideration  
6 regarding the law enforcement matter. I would suggest that  
7 you consider that it be coordinated with law enforcement  
8 rather than seek concurrence for a downward zone. I think  
9 it's important we coordinate but I don't know that they  
10 always have to concur in every case because it is based on  
11 the engineering study.

12 With regard to a registered engineer. Throughout  
13 the manual we have words like engineering study, engineering  
14 judgment. And I don't know of any other case where we then  
15 specifically state, shall be signed by a registered  
16 engineer. And then we get into, well, registered traffic  
17 engineer or registered civil engineer. I think if we stick  
18 with the words "an engineering study" that's something that  
19 you might want to consider.

20 Finally, through our discussions we tried to come  
21 up with some stronger, more beefed up language regarding the  
22 situations in which you could take a five mile an hour  
23 reduction. And I think it is important to retain much of  
24 that language so that we don't have the routine five mile an  
25 hour reductions that I think we saw were happening before.

1 MR. COPP: Right. That's well taken, thank you.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just also a  
3 clarification on that one. The rounding to the nearest and  
4 the five mile reduction subject to ETS is the same five mile  
5 reduction that the Vehicle Code authorizes. There are not  
6 two five mile reductions.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There's one five  
9 mile reduction under ETS.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Is rounding to  
11 the nearest a shall or should condition?

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It's to shall. Before  
13 it was should. If we keep it same like it was then it's  
14 should.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It's should.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It's should?

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It's should.

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: If we keep it in 2004  
19 language, the 2004 language says should. What the committee  
20 recommended, then we change to shall. But if we keep it in  
21 2004 language then it is should.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you for  
23 clarification.

24 MR. COPP: What the Director wanted was shall.

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Okay, so we are going

1 to change it from should to shall.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Right.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, I guess you  
4 guys have been talking already.

5 So we go to Chief Maynard.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I think Mr. Fisher made  
7 some very good points. You know, I would have to agree.  
8 And we talked about forming the subcommittee. There should  
9 be coordination with the law enforcement agency, whatever  
10 agency that is that is going to be enforcing the speed  
11 limits that are established.

12 I think the use of the word concurrence is a  
13 little bit strong. I don't think that law enforcement  
14 agencies should be in the position to completely overturn an  
15 engineering study or have the right of veto. But there has  
16 to be that communication if you are going to have effective  
17 enforcement of speed limits.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well I just wanted to  
20 point out we do appreciate the process. Because we  
21 certainly learned in trying to fix the 2004 problems we  
22 could make it worse. And through the public process at  
23 least we undid that damage.

24 MR. COPP: Right.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But it is my

1 understanding from the league that, you know, we are pretty  
2 much back where we were at the beginning of this discussion  
3 when we were trying to keep it out of the Legislature and  
4 solve that in-house. And actually we are right back where  
5 we were with the same concerns that we had over the fact  
6 that the 2004 regulations are tighter than the old  
7 California Traffic Manual and it does require the increasing  
8 of speed limits. So the Thousand Oaks issues, all the  
9 issues that were being brought up that kind of, you know,  
10 started this whole discussion we are pretty much right back  
11 there again. I expect that we will be talking about this  
12 some more.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Babico.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I agree with what Farhad  
15 Mansourian said and I agree with him and support to that.  
16 But one thing I would like to have a point of clarification.  
17 The 85th percentile during the speed surveys, radar speed  
18 surveys. Always you will see differences between the upper  
19 limit of the paced speed than the 85 calculated. So in  
20 considering the nearest of the 85th, the language of that.  
21 Is it the 85th calculated or it is the upper limit of the  
22 paced speed? Because there is a difference.

23 So do we leave it to the judgment of the engineer  
24 who is providing this? Because in many cases when you go  
25 and do this speed survey you will see the 85th is higher

1 than the upper limit of the paced speed. The paced speed is  
2 the maximum percentages of the drivers within that sample.  
3 So the upper limit of the paced speed is lower than the 85th  
4 percentile calculated. Which one do you take to judge or to  
5 adjust for the nearest five miles per hour increment?

6 That's my point. Otherwise I agree with what Mansourian  
7 said.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Although the idea is  
9 to have suggestions for the Caltrans staff's consideration.  
10 So that's what you are bringing up and they will consider.  
11 By the way, I see Robert McLaughlin here. She has been  
12 instrumental in working on this issue with us and with  
13 Director Kempton. If you don't like the result you know who  
14 to blame.

15 Okay, thank you, Mr. Copp. I'll have the  
16 audience, anybody who wants to speak. And then if there are  
17 issues again. You know, it's for consideration and  
18 recommendation at this time only.

19 Anybody who wishes to comment on this issue for  
20 Caltrans' consideration and sharing with the Committee?  
21 Chief Hudson.

22 CHIEF HUDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members  
23 of the Committee. My name is Jim Hudson. Again, I am here  
24 to represent the 338 independent police chiefs throughout  
25 the state of California.

1           First of all speaking absolutely in support of  
2 Director Kempton's decision on this thing. And again, I  
3 know you don't want to hear the details of that because it  
4 is what it is. But we want to thank not only Director  
5 Kempton and the Commissioner of the Highway Patrol as well  
6 certainly for bringing us into this process. and we  
7 appreciate the fact that our concerns were certainly paid  
8 attention to.

9           And what I would offer is that we would be very  
10 willing to sit on a committee involving any further follow-  
11 up discussions that need to be had in terms of some of the  
12 defining terminology or whatever we need to do. I'm happy  
13 to see that that gets facilitated through our organization.

14           Again, thank you to the engineering community for  
15 reaching out to law enforcement. I know that we work on a  
16 daily basis with the traffic engineers in all of our cities  
17 and we absolutely concur that this is something that we need  
18 to do arm in arm. And again, to the extent that we can  
19 continue to do that we appreciate that we were brought into  
20 this process. And anything that we can do to help make this  
21 a smooth transition we will certainly do. So thank you  
22 again for your time.

23           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Again,  
24 you know, when you put that subcommittee together, you know.  
25 Chief Hudson and I worked together about what, four or five



1 years in our early careers. We can definitely bring good  
2 value to your discussions.

3 Mr. Lissner.

4 MR. LISSNER: Jim Lissner, Hermosa Beach. I have  
5 been watching the Legislature and they have three bills  
6 there right now to basically drill holes in the speed trap  
7 law. One of them could be voted on while we are sitting  
8 here, AB 564. It's from -- It's sponsored by the City of  
9 Pasadena. And it would basically allow them to double  
10 classify streets. Call a street a collector street for  
11 purposes of collecting federal aid to urban highways money  
12 and call it a local street to escape from the rule of the  
13 speed trap law.

14 I wish I had brought my cell phone with me today  
15 so I could call the clerk up in Sacramento and find out what  
16 happened to that bill and maybe there's somebody here who  
17 already knows. But it was on the agenda for a third reading  
18 and possible vote today. I would be interested in anybody's  
19 reactions to that here because basically it looks like if  
20 they pass that the Legislature will trump all of what is  
21 being done here. Thank you.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you,  
23 Mr. Lissner. Yes, 564. I think there was a technicality  
24 error with the amendment that restricted it to Pasadena.  
25 They are working up in Sacramento. It's number 75 on the

1 agenda for the Assembly today. I don't know what is going  
2 to happen this afternoon. It's probably up for vote about  
3 two o'clock. But it has its challenges in the Senate.

4 And 766, the other one that you are referring to.  
5 It just died in the Trans Committee, it didn't go anywhere.

6 Anybody else on the issue? Mr. Roseman.

7 MR. ROSEMAN: Dave Roseman, City of Long Beach.

8 Actually I'm a little stunned by the decision but  
9 I would want to forward one comment. I think it's important  
10 to separate the engineering side from the enforcement side.  
11 I think that's very critical in all of the things that we  
12 do.

13 So if we are to work with our PDs in setting speed  
14 limits lower I would offer up the word consult rather than  
15 coordinate or concur. I think that word is used also in  
16 other, in other areas within our own profession. So  
17 consulting is one thing.

18 Coordinating, that implies that you actually have  
19 to come to some decision. And I think ultimately the  
20 recommendation should be an engineering recommendation that  
21 takes into consideration a consultation with enforcement.  
22 Thank you.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. And  
24 thank you again, Mr. Roseman. I know you were part of the  
25 subcommittee working with Caltrans, with Johnny on the

1 revising text and all that.

2 Anybody else on the issue? Mina? No, I'm just  
3 picking on you. It's your favorite item.

4 Okay, seeing none we close the public comment on  
5 this. Mr. Copp, thank you very much. You heard the  
6 suggestions and comments from members of the audience and  
7 the committee members. Hopefully July 1st we will have the  
8 new language.

9 Until that time, for the local agencies, if you  
10 have speed zones with radar recertification, the existing  
11 language controls. And after that time pretty much the  
12 existing language will still control with a little bit of  
13 clarification.

14 Okay, thank you very much. Let's go back to our  
15 regular flow of the items. The folks who were here for the  
16 speed limit can leave.

17 Okay, Item 09-5, amendment to California MUTCD,  
18 size of regulatory signs. Mr. Henley.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. As you know the  
20 California MUTCD has a little softer language than the  
21 federal MUTCD as far as whether, you know, to use the  
22 standard highway signs book as far as which signs to select.

23 And because there was an inconsistency between the  
24 manual and the standard highway signs book we softened it to  
25 say, instead of the signs shall be consistent with the book,

1 we said, they should.

2 Here again the FHWA takes a dim view on us  
3 relaxing standards. So we have decided what we really need  
4 to do is get that book up to, you know, up to standards.  
5 And so what we are proposing is we are proposing to tighten  
6 up our language so that we, you know. We shall be  
7 consistent with the table that shows the signs.

8 Unfortunately that table has not been updated yet.  
9 And so what we want to do at this point. I would like to  
10 get a motion to approve our language contingent on the  
11 completion of that table and then you won't see this issue  
12 again.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, members,  
14 questions?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No questions. Ready  
17 for motion?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I just had a question  
19 about the process. You know, we were bringing up examples  
20 of places like where the Xing sign in a school legend is  
21 actually on a larger background than the School, even though  
22 School is a bigger word than Xing. So I was wondering how  
23 are we going to -- or what the form is for agencies to  
24 participate. Whether it's a teleconference or whatever, in  
25 trying to standardize that table and coming up with, you

1 know, reasonable sign sizes as a practical application.

2 Because when we are buying in bulk to update all  
3 of our school area signs, you know, the dog house sign can  
4 vary in size depending on exactly what is being shown on it.  
5 And the more we standardize the backgrounds the cheaper our  
6 prices when we are buying in bulk. So I just wanted to know  
7 how we can participate in that discussion when it comes to  
8 standardizing the sizes. So that when we do -- you know,  
9 the shall be the standard size, we kind of had some input on  
10 what that size should be. Especially where there's  
11 irregularities in those sizes that don't seem to have a  
12 logical reason for why the size is varied.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well you know, we have  
14 the technology now to have, you know, video phone  
15 conferences and that sort of thing. Maybe that's what, you  
16 know, the guy that's putting that table together can do some  
17 kind of a, you know, statewide -- I forgot the term for it.  
18 Almost like a web conference.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And we could do that.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That would be great.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. So before we come  
23 up with a final table, which I don't see coming for another  
24 month or so, we'll make sure that everybody that wants to  
25 gets a chance.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Mr. Chairman.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, Mr. Babico.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I believe one time we  
4 had this school signing presented by the City of Santa Ana  
5 at the time and we approved all the modifications and  
6 Caltrans has it. And I believe -- why don't you take that  
7 item too together with the preparation of the table and  
8 finalize it. So there will be no discrepancies between the  
9 shall/should and the table and what we have agreed as a  
10 recommendation for the school signing to readjust these  
11 sizes.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well I think the guy  
13 that was working on that table is aware of that.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay, that's good.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: The thing is lately he's  
16 been working on the ARRA signs, which will be on the agenda  
17 a little later. And there was a lot of work that went into  
18 that.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The propaganda signs  
20 for the federal government.

21 (Laughter.)

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Not just the federal  
23 government.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: On this same

1 topic. We are saying that what is shown in Table 2C-2,  
2 which is a FHWA table, right?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Did they  
5 have any discrepancies between the size of their warning  
6 signs and the size of the plates that go below it?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'm not sure. Is Matt  
8 here?

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Matt said there are  
10 discrepancies but they are working on it.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Introduce yourself.

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: My name is Devinder  
13 Singh, I am the Secretary for the Committee.

14 During the last meeting Matt mentioned that there are  
15 some discrepancies between the signs. But there are efforts,  
16 they are already working on that. During the last meeting, the  
17 Committee made a recommendation subject to the Table 7B-1 of the  
18 school signs. If Caltrans bring updated the Table 7B-1 then the  
19 Committee will approve this item. Caltrans was not able to update the  
20 school table. That's the reason we are asking the Committee  
21 recommend approval of this item subject to the school table update.

22 MR. SCHMITZ: Matt Schmitz, Federal Highways. I  
23 think just to clarify. You are exactly right about other  
24 discrepancies. I think this specific question was, are  
25 there instances of the plaque size or letter heights

1 exceeding that of the main sign itself. And that's outside  
2 of the discrepancies that I had talked about in Lincoln.

3 I can't say. I don't think any of us have taken a  
4 look at that within the standard highway signs book or the  
5 national MUTCD. So that's an outstanding question.  
6 Certainly one we can follow up if you see value in it.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. I  
8 thought this is a 30 second item, what happened.

9 Okay, anybody else has comments on this?

10 Do I have a motion?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So moved.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Second.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You can't second  
14 your own item. Okay. We have a motion and a second.  
15 Discussion?

16 Seeing none, all those in favor?

17 (Ayes.)

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition? The  
19 motion passes unanimously.

20 Item 09-6, amendment to MUTCD Section 2D.45  
21 General Service Signs.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay, this has to do  
23 with basically STAA truck routes and the fact that, you  
24 know, we pretty well design our state highways to get the  
25 trucks to the communities. And then we sign it such. From



1   there the communities need to take responsibility for their  
2   roads to make sure that the vehicles, the STAA trucks can  
3   get to wherever they're going.

4                   And I guess it wasn't quite clear as to who  
5   decides if those roads are adequate for the trucks. And  
6   Caltrans does not want to get in the business of deciding.  
7   You know, surveying and everything of all the local roads to  
8   make sure that their roads are consistent with the STAA  
9   trucks.

10                  And so we are making the language in the MUTCD a  
11   little more clear and basically saying that the local  
12   jurisdiction has informed the department in writing, so that  
13   there's none of this phone call stuff, that the local road  
14   and intersections on the proposed terminal access route meet  
15   the geometric criteria for STAA trucks. And so if a truck  
16   gets into a neighborhood and something like that and starts  
17   knocking out infrastructure that at least it's not Caltrans  
18   that sent them there.

19                  COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's fine. It  
20   kind of excludes about 90 percent of cities and  
21   intersections in the city of Los Angeles in not meeting STAA  
22   requirements. Anyway, okay. Mr. Mansourian.

23                  COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Wayne, I have a  
24   question. On page 19 under the proposal, the red language.

25                  COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Your intention is,  
2 or Caltrans's intention is the local government needs to  
3 analyze their own street, correct?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Exactly, it's self-  
5 certification.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The way I'm reading  
7 this, and maybe it needs to be flipped. It says, the local  
8 jurisdiction has informed the department in writing that  
9 local roads and intersections on the proposed local terminal  
10 access route meet all geometric criteria. Fine. And the  
11 state highway ramp also meets it. You don't mean the locals  
12 to analyze the state route ramps --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: You see what I'm  
15 saying? I think, I think it should be flipped.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes, because it does  
17 look like -- just the way it's worded that --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Do you see what I'm  
19 saying?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes, I see what you  
21 mean, yes.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: We discussed what  
23 your intention is and I agree. The locals analyze theirs  
24 but not to analyze yours.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Exactly, yes.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Is that clear?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: That's clear. We'll  
3 change the language to make sure that that's clear.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Makes sense, good  
5 point. Any other discussion?

6 Anybody from the public wishes to address the  
7 issue?

8 Locals are okay.

9 Okay. Do I have a motion?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'll make the motion  
11 with that clarification to be done in the final language.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: A motion. Is there  
13 a second?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Second.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There's a motion and  
16 a second. Discussion?

17 Seeing none, all those in favor?

18 (Ayes.)

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition? Seeing  
20 none the motion passes unanimously.

21 Okay, Request for Experimentation 09-9. Last time  
22 we delayed this because the staff person from LA DOT was not  
23 present. Mr. Fisher, it's your item. Request to experiment  
24 with steady red light.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes,

1 Mr. Chairman. While he is setting up I would like to  
2 indicate that we have a joint, that the City of Los Angeles  
3 Department of Transportation has a joint effort underway  
4 with the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, the regional  
5 transit carrier.

6           There was a project in the city to install a bus  
7 way called the Orange Line. And the bus way was installed  
8 on an old rail right of way. The bus traverses the San  
9 Fernando Valley area of the city, about 14 miles from end to  
10 end. And using the old railroad right of way we created  
11 signalized intersections where initially we had problems  
12 with motorists recognizing the crossing as an intersection.

13           So we looked at a number of things we would want  
14 to do. And one of the items that was considered was to use  
15 in-pavement lights in addition to the signal controls that  
16 would illuminate to red when there is a red signal  
17 indication in effect. And thus that would provide another  
18 way of helping motorists to identify that there is a signal  
19 there, that there is an intersection there, and another way  
20 for them to know they have to stop.

21           And the chief person on this who is studying this  
22 is Mr. Kang Hu, who is a senior transportation engineer for  
23 LA DOT. And I am going to allow him to make a brief  
24 presentation before the Committee to summarize the work that  
25 he wants to undertake.

1           And I should mention that this already has the  
2   experimentation approval of the Federal Highway  
3   Administration. So Kang.

4           MR. HU: Good morning. I guess it's good  
5   afternoon, huh? Okay, I have a few slides I wanted to go  
6   over with you. John already indicated that this is a  
7   request to experiment with steady red stop line lights.  
8   It's in-pavement lights but it does not flash. It would  
9   just show steady, solid red when comparable signal phases  
10   red and all other times it will stay dark. So no flashing,  
11   it would just be steady red. Next slide.

12           Just very quick background. This experiment will  
13   be conducted mostly on the metro Orange Line. The bus way  
14   connecting from North Hollywood Station to Walnut Center in  
15   the San Fernando Valley. It's 14 miles long. Next slide.

16           It was opened in 2005. We have about 40  
17   crossings. When it was opened there were some accidents.  
18   People are not familiar with the operation. We have  
19   implemented a lot of traffic engineering enhancements,  
20   traffic control devices and improvements. Also we worked  
21   with MTA and the LA Sheriff's Department to enforce and also  
22   enhance the education.

23           We have installed quite a lot of red light cameras  
24   on major crossings. But still the violations of the red  
25   lights are high. They are a couple of hundreds per week in

1 some of the locations. That's why we would like to  
2 experiment with the steady red stop lights to reduce the red  
3 light running. Next slide.

4 These are some of the slides of the existing  
5 crossing. A bus way crossing in Reseda, one of the major  
6 arterials. You can see the signals and also there's a  
7 station to your right. Next slide.

8 And this is where the bus way runs in the median  
9 of the right of way and we have a protected left turn phase.  
10 Next slide.

11 And this is a right turn, protected right turn  
12 arrow. The car that you see is making a right turn. The  
13 crossing to your right is where the bus way is. And we have  
14 right arrows and no right turn on red. Also flashing "bus  
15 approaching" signs. Next.

16 And we also beef up the operations by adding no  
17 turns and then bus flashing signs. Next slide.

18 And we have pavement markings. Over here this is  
19 where the bus way crossing is. And we will be putting the  
20 in-pavement lights. Next slide.

21 Yes, this is just the details. This is one of the  
22 locations we are going to experiment. Next slide.

23 And we have the stop light that's in front of the  
24 "keep clear" message. Okay, next slide.

25 We propose to experiment with these in-pavement

1 lights at five locations. Four locations are along the bus  
2 way and one will be at the Metro Blue Line location. Most  
3 of the crossing streets are major highways. Next one.

4 This is a little difficult to see but this is the  
5 design plan that we have developed. If you see the solid  
6 line on the top that is where the in-pavement lights will be  
7 installed. On the top is where the crossing, the bus way  
8 crossing is. And then at the center of the diagram is the  
9 adjacent section of Victory and De Soto. Next slide.

10 And this is similar that we will be putting in the  
11 in-pavement lights right at the stop light. And about one  
12 foot or two off from the outside of the crosswalk. Next  
13 slide.

14 And this is another location. Okay, this is the  
15 detail. As you can see that we are proposing to putting the  
16 lights about two feet apart so it will be very bright. The  
17 drivers won't have any excuses not seeing it. I guess a lot  
18 of people are saying that they look up but they don't look  
19 down. With an in-pavement light that's very clear that they  
20 won't miss it. We want to install this at five locations.  
21 And then -- next slide.

22 The evaluation plan. As John indicated we already  
23 obtained Federal Highway Administration's approval. We  
24 submitted the engineering plans to them.

25 And we also will use the red light cameras that we

1 have along the bus ways to collect before and after  
2 violation data. We will also select a control site having  
3 comparable conditions to check the traffic conditions so  
4 that we can have a fair comparison. And also the Federal  
5 Highway Administration indicated that we need to use these  
6 empirical based statistical measures to minimize the effect  
7 of regression to the mean. And then after the installation  
8 we will prepare a semiannual and final report.

9           These five locations have already been designed  
10 and we are working to get a contractor on board. Right now  
11 there is a little bit delay because of the funding  
12 arrangement in MTA, who is paying for the entire cost.  
13 There's a bit of funding issues that we had to work out.  
14 But we expect to get this installed later this year.

15           That's pretty much it. I'm here to answer any  
16 questions.

17           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you for your  
18 presentation. Members, any questions?

19           No questions?

20           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'll just ask  
21 one.

22           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes.

23           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Kang, what would  
24 be the comparable sites that you would use for comparison?  
25 Would they be bus way crossings or would they be somewhere



1 else?

2 MR. HU: It will be bus way crossings. We have 40  
3 signalized intersections along the bus way and we are only  
4 choosing 4 locations for experiment. So the other locations  
5 we will be using as the control sites.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just one question.  
7 I assume that for your before/after studies you are not  
8 going to rely only on the number. Because you want to  
9 measure if it is going to increase effectiveness for  
10 compliance. It will help us if you come back with rates  
11 rather than numbers. So measure the traffic volumes during  
12 those periods also.

13 MR. HU: Sure.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: To make sure that  
15 you understand if there is a reduction in the number of  
16 violations it is not associated with reduction in volume,  
17 there's actual reduction in rate.

18 MR. HU: Well certainly we will look at the  
19 accident rate. We are able to --

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Not only accident  
21 rates. I'm assuming that you are measuring the violations  
22 also.

23 MR. HU: Yes, violation rates. Yes, that will be  
24 included, yes.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: But what I am saying

1 is violation rates rather than numbers.

2 MR. HU: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other questions?

4 Any member of the public? Mr. Lissner.

5 MR. LISSNER: I want to --

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Could you speak here  
7 so they can record it.

8 MR. LISSNER: Jim Lissner, Hermosa Beach. A  
9 couple of years ago I looked at the violations on the bus  
10 way. I requested from Metro and the Sheriff that runs the  
11 system for them a sampling, a three day sampling of the late  
12 times of the tickets. And they were really unusual because  
13 there were a lot of -- on a typical red light camera the  
14 typical late time, average late time is about four-tenths of  
15 a second. On the bus way the average late time was around  
16 ten seconds. And there were a lot of late times, scary, up  
17 in the 20 and 30 second range.

18 So I guess when you're evaluating -- And those are  
19 the ones that are going to hit a bus. So maybe when you are  
20 evaluating this thing you should have a look and see if you  
21 are removing or stopping those really, really late  
22 instances. In other words, just looking at the number of  
23 violations, raw number of violations, won't tell you whether  
24 you are stopping those really, really late people. And  
25 those are the people that scare me. I mean, it scares me

1 for themselves and for the people on the buses. Thank you.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: With the red light,  
3 if you have a red light camera at this intersection you can  
4 measure that, can't you?

5 MR. HU: Yes. And we are able to record how late  
6 the violation run into the signal red. So that's a very  
7 good suggestion. We will follow up with that. The  
8 Sheriff's Department does collect the data. The statement  
9 is correct. There are quite a lot of violations that run  
10 deep into the red signals. And that's one of the problems  
11 that we are trying to correct. So we will collect that  
12 data.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Anybody else? Yes  
14 sir. Mr. Shanteau, let him come first. There is a  
15 gentleman before you.

16 MR. SCHUMACHER: Hello. My name is Kevin  
17 Schumacher, I am with the Public Utilities Commission in the  
18 rail crossing section. We also deal with transit safety of  
19 light rail systems.

20 And certainly the left turn problem has been an  
21 issue with light rail for years. And so we are happy to  
22 support and see this going forward, some testing on the  
23 light rail system at Washington.

24 I am hoping that we can get some results that show  
25 that it is effective along light rail lines in particular.

1 And to that end I don't know if Los Angeles might be willing  
2 to consider further evaluation along the light rail or maybe  
3 identify key distinctions between the bus way and light rail  
4 application.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

6 Mr. Shanteau.

7 DR. SHANTEAU: I did have two now I have three  
8 comments. First is that Kang mentioned that there are what  
9 four or five? You said five intersections have been  
10 selected?

11 MR. HU: Five.

12 DR. SHANTEAU: I would like to ask how those  
13 intersections were selected because I hope they were not  
14 selected by hand through some sort of random process.

15 MR. HU: Well they were selected based on the  
16 accident and violation. The red light violation rates.  
17 These are our locations where the red light violation is  
18 high. But also we want to avoid overly complicating the  
19 intersections. And these are the intersections that we can  
20 easily put in those in-pavement lights that it does not  
21 cause any confusion. So these are the criteria.

22 DR. SHANTEAU: But this is an experiment. And for  
23 an experiment you want to be able to expand what you have  
24 learned from your sample to your total population of  
25 intersections to which you might want to apply it someday.

1 And so it is very important that you have a random selection  
2 so that you don't bias. I know they are using Bayesian  
3 estimates. But if you pick your worst intersections how do  
4 you know that your experiment applies to the other  
5 intersections that are not in your handpicked set?

6 Let's see. The second point is that in reading  
7 and rereading and studying Section 1A-10 of the MUTCD it  
8 does say that if something, if the results of the experiment  
9 are somewhat adverse then the agency has to agree to remove  
10 the experiment. And has that?

11 MR. HU: Yes.

12 DR. SHANTEAU: Okay, thank you.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It is part of our  
14 process, Bob.

15 DR. SHANTEAU: Great. And third is that as a  
16 transportation engineer I'm a bit dismayed to see rapid  
17 transit that is not grade separated. And apparently there's  
18 a lot of it in LA and I'm surprised. Just because the old  
19 trains ran at grade doesn't mean they should run at grade  
20 now. And so I would hope that -- and the PUC apparently has  
21 gone along with all these -- especially all these new rail  
22 highway grade crossings. So I would be very concerned about  
23 that.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Shanteau, I'd  
25 appreciate if you keep your comments on the issue within our

1 purview. Grade separation is not our purview.

2 DR. SHANTEAU: The purview is here that the reason  
3 this is being brought up is that the bus way is not grade  
4 separated. I would say that's not good transportation  
5 planning.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.  
7 Chad.

8 MR. DORNSIFE: This is one of the areas -- Chad  
9 Dornsife, Best Highway Safety Practices. This is one of the  
10 areas that I work in and I have installed some of these in-  
11 road lighting systems.

12 I would say that just minor technical details.  
13 That the two foot spacing is ill advised. I put in a system  
14 down at the border patrol checkpoint in San Ysidro. We used  
15 both red stop line and the flashing amber. But when you  
16 have got high traffic areas like Los Angeles you need to  
17 make sure that you have got good coverage but you want to  
18 space them so they are not in the tire tracks themselves  
19 because they will get destroyed in short order. So there is  
20 a spacing that we determined would give us good coverage but  
21 not -- that would also survive.

22 The other thing is in a Houston light rail  
23 application we actually had them hooked up where the train  
24 as it went down turned on the red lights to the turn lanes  
25 and everything and actually created a prohibition zone in

1 advance of the train. So as the train moved down the track  
2 these lights lit up so many seconds ahead or a minute ahead  
3 to close those lanes off. So you may find additional areas  
4 where you may want to close the lane or a turn lane in  
5 advance of a vehicle approaching. Other than that they work  
6 well.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

8 Anyone else? Ms. Wells. I forgot to thank you  
9 for all your work on the speed limit issue also.

10 MS. WELLS: Thank you.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

12 MS. WELLS: Laura Wells, City of San Jose. You  
13 know me, I have to say something.

14 I'm assuming that the intersections that these are  
15 going at with the red light cameras are locations where the  
16 cameras are also used for automated enforcement. And I can  
17 understand the reasoning behind that, so that you can use  
18 the cameras to collect the before and after data.

19 But I am wondering, and what is going through my  
20 mind because San Jose doesn't have red light cameras for  
21 automated enforcement is, have you considered installing  
22 these in-road lights at intersections where you don't have  
23 the cameras where you might also have a problem or an issue  
24 with red light running? And so what would be the impact of  
25 these in-road pavement lights to address the violations in

1 comparison to intersections that have the cameras. Because  
2 cities may want to look at putting these in-road lights in  
3 in lieu of cameras if they are effective.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's a good point.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Mr. Chairman?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Do you have a  
7 question for Ms. Wells?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Just clarification to  
9 what she said.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Laura, do you mind  
11 coming back.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I believe the slide  
13 regarding the red camera, red light camera is to collect  
14 data, not to surveillance. There will be no signs I  
15 believe, that's my question to John, that will be advance  
16 signs indicating camera enforcement. This is only to  
17 collect data, not surveillance cameras.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'll let Kang  
19 address that. But my understanding is that red light photo  
20 enforcement was another measure that was put in to try to  
21 seek compliance with stopping at the intersections. But  
22 Kang, why don't you go into --

23 MR. HU: Yes we have those, the red light cameras  
24 already installed.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: As a surveillance?



1           MR. HU: With advanced warning, with advanced  
2 warning signs.

3           COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: As a surveillance? As a  
4 surveillance?

5           MR. HU: As a --

6           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: As an enforcement  
7 measure.

8           MR. HU: Enforcement, yes.

9           COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Enforcement, okay. As  
10 enforcement.

11          MR. HU: Yes.

12          COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Then she has a point.  
13 That it will be a different application when you have --  
14 without cameras, intersections not enforced by cameras.

15          MR. HU: Correct.

16          COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Are you going to  
17 experiment in-highway lights with intersections without the  
18 cameras enforcement?

19          MR. HU: That will be our next step if this  
20 experiment proves successful.

21          COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay.

22          MR. HU: And also pending upon funding  
23 availability.

24          COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. Because my  
25 understanding from the slide. These cameras, they are

1 installed only to collect data before and after, not to  
2 enforce it.

3 MR. HU: The red light cameras are already there  
4 to enforce the red light violations. They are already  
5 there.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, you can install  
7 cameras without enforcement just to collect data. We did  
8 that.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Just another  
10 point on that. Let me see if there is anyone else in the  
11 audience then we'll bring it back. Anybody else who wishes  
12 to speak on this item?

13 Seeing none we'll close it, bring it back to the  
14 Committee. Ms. Wells has a point. Even if you come back  
15 with your data the data is good only for places where you  
16 have red light camera enforcement. So what kind of  
17 recommendation do you expect out of that? That these things  
18 can be used only at intersections where there is a red light  
19 camera?

20 I mean, the recommendation is going to be very  
21 limited because the rate of compliance at red light camera  
22 and without red light camera is very different. So when you  
23 measure the improvement to the compliance you are comparing  
24 apples and oranges. The results of your experimentation may  
25 not have a statewide application. So what she is saying is

1 that it is good if you can add, and especially since it is  
2 part of your next phase, it's good if you can add a couple  
3 of intersections without red light cameras.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well but Kang,  
5 don't we have red light cameras at all crossings?

6 MR. HU: Yes, we have red cameras for all  
7 crossings on the bus ways. And also the locations where we  
8 experiment with the Metro Blue Line has a red light camera.  
9 But there are locations on the Metro Blue Lines that we  
10 don't have red light cameras. That could be our next step.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: If you have funding  
12 available it helps. Because quite frankly I don't see how  
13 much benefit the state is going to get from the result of  
14 this experimentation. Because it is going to be limited  
15 only for the red light camera installations.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes. I think  
17 what this experiment will tell us, what additional  
18 compliance can we get once we have tried --

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Off the red light  
20 cameras.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Once we have  
22 tried all the legal conventional measures, what further  
23 increment can we get with this. I don't think it is a  
24 comparison of what works best, cameras or embedded lights.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, so you are

1 seeing this as an addition to a red light camera.

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's what the  
3 experiment is.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, fair enough.  
5 Then maybe next phase looks at the issue that Ms. Wells  
6 brought up.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. Maybe if  
8 this is successful then we might want to look at other  
9 applications for the embedded.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Or maybe San Jose  
11 wants to request an experimentation. Because this is like  
12 completely new for federal also. Because both the federal  
13 and Caltrans manual, our manual, it prohibits the use of in-  
14 pavement lighting where there is a signal.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's true.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It doesn't even  
17 leave the option open, it prohibits it.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's true.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, any other  
20 discussion, question from the Committee members?

21 Seeing none do I have a motion?

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I move approval  
23 of the experiment.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You guys can't make  
25 a motion on your own -- somebody else has to think it's a

1 good idea.

2 (Laughter.)

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I'll move to approve.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Deborah has moved.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, I have a

6 motion.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Second.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Second. Discussion?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Now he can oppose  
10 it.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Or he can question.

12 Okay, I have a motion and a second. Any discussions?

13 Okay, all in favor?

14 (Ayes.)

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The motion passes.

16 Moving along. Okay, 13 and 14 are kind of --

17 09-13 and 09-14 are kind of interconnected somehow, aren't  
18 they, Mr. Henley?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes they are, they both  
20 have to do with carpool HOV --

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Do you prefer to  
22 handle them one at a time or do you want to do both?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes, we want to keep  
24 them separate.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Because they are  
2 separate communities.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: let's go with the  
4 first one, experiment request for usage of "HOV" in lieu of  
5 "carpool" for the City of Los Angeles.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay, I want to  
7 introduce Joe Rouse, who is basically our specialist on HOV  
8 or carpool issues. And he is working with a number of  
9 folks, I think, to make a presentation on what their  
10 experiment is. And we are talking about changing some of  
11 the signing that we use for carpool lanes.

12 MR. ROUSE: Thank you, Wayne, and thank you  
13 members of the Committee. I first want to apologize for my  
14 appearance. I broke my finger a few weeks ago and look like  
15 a monster. It doesn't hurt as bad as it looks. And thank  
16 you for the opportunity to present before you today.

17 I just want to give you a brief background on the  
18 concept of high occupancy toll lanes for those who are not  
19 familiar with it.

20 There has been much interest around the state for  
21 the last several years on the concept of roadway pricing as  
22 a means of managing congestion and as a way to provide  
23 options and choices for travelers that use our freeway  
24 networks.

25 There is also the theory that we want to try to

1 connect motorists with the concept of supply and demand. If  
2 you use a roadway at a certain hour of the day the cost of  
3 the maintenance and operation of that facility should be  
4 passed back on to the user. That's the thinking that is  
5 going around in some circles.

6 And because of that there has been a movement  
7 around the state, particularly amongst the regional  
8 transportation agencies, to start opening up our HOV lanes  
9 on our freeways to solo drivers who are willing to pay a  
10 toll. The basic concept is that those solo drivers would be  
11 equipped with the FasTrak electric toll collection  
12 transponder equipment. And the vehicles that meet the  
13 occupancy requirements already would not have to pay the  
14 toll. However, the operator of the facility might require  
15 to HOVs to have transponders or to register in some form.

16 The first experimentation with pricing in  
17 California happened on the State Route 91 express lanes here  
18 in Orange County in 1995. That was followed a year later by  
19 the conversion of the HOV lanes on I-15 in San Diego to high  
20 occupancy toll. Both have been the subject of much review  
21 and study. And based on their successful operation and  
22 performance the legislature has since passed laws allowing  
23 several regional transportation agencies to operate HOT  
24 lanes in different parts of the state.

25 There is also a bill working its way through the

1 Legislature that would allow for the entire conversion of  
2 the HOV network in the San Francisco Bay Area to a high  
3 occupancy toll network.

4           Here in Los Angeles the Metropolitan  
5 Transportation Authority has received approval from the  
6 state legislature based on an agreement that was drawn up  
7 between LA Metro, Caltrans and the United States Department  
8 of Transportation last year in which about -- over \$200  
9 million in federal grants were given to the region to  
10 implement a congestion reduction demonstration program. It  
11 focuses on two corridors, Interstate 10 from the east  
12 heading into downtown Los Angeles and Interstate 110 from  
13 the south heading into downtown Los Angeles.

14           This project has a heavy emphasis on transit  
15 service improvements in the corridor. About 75 percent of  
16 the money is going to transit service, improved transit  
17 service. New buses, things like that. They are hoping to  
18 improve headway substantially on these routes.

19           And both the HOV lanes on these facilities are  
20 planned to be converted to HOT lanes. And as part of that  
21 the FHWA has been very heavily involved in developing the  
22 signage that is going to be used on these facilities. And  
23 as you are probably aware there is currently no guidance in  
24 the federal MUTCD or the California MUTCD for the signage of  
25 HOT lane. So like I said, FHWA has been working closely



1 with LA Metro on this.

2 In the packet there are some diagrams of what the  
3 signage would look like. I would like to talk to you just  
4 real briefly about that. I also have an additional handout  
5 here. I guess Devinder, can you share this with the  
6 Committee. And there are extras for any in the audience who  
7 might like to look at it.

8 Basically there are three concepts that are going  
9 to be introduced in these signs that are new to California.  
10 I'll give you all a minute to catch up with us here. The  
11 examples I'm referring to are on page 37 and 38 of the  
12 agenda.

13 The first non-standard feature is the term  
14 "express lane." And we are looking at using that in lieu of  
15 "HOT" for the entire state. This is also at the  
16 recommendation of FHWA. It is likely to be the national  
17 standard. The thinking is the term "express lane" indicates  
18 to the user that it provides a premium service. I think it  
19 would be a little more readily understood than the term  
20 "HOT."

21 The second change, which is a radical change for  
22 California, is the use of the term "HOV" instead of  
23 "carpool." The reason for this is because this project in  
24 particular is expected to encompass all classes of multi-  
25 occupant vehicles including buses and van pools. As I

1 indicated there's a heavy amount of money going towards  
2 transit in this project and there is also going to be a  
3 movement trying to encourage people to form van pools and  
4 things like that. Also the term HOV is the current federal  
5 standard.

6 And finally, this deals with the handout that I  
7 just handed to the members of the Committee. They want to  
8 use the color purple on these signs. And the color purple  
9 is being considered as the national standard for toll  
10 facilities.

11 One other thing that I want to point out, which is  
12 another huge change, is that these signs do not incorporate  
13 the diamond. And again this is per the federal  
14 recommendation as this facility is not going to be a pure  
15 HOV facility. FHWA after many years and much debate in the  
16 2003 MUTCD adopted the diamond as strictly being for an HOV  
17 facility. The thinking is that if we adopt it for a HOT  
18 facility, or an express lane in this case, we would be  
19 moving backwards. So we have been directed to not use the  
20 diamond on these signs.

21 Another thing I want to point out, and it also  
22 deals with the sample that I just brought to you there, is  
23 that FHWA has also recommended that we do not post an  
24 occupancy requirement if the HOVs have to carry a  
25 transponder. Now this is still being debated within LA

1 Metro. I believe they are pretty close to making a policy  
2 decision which would require HOVs to carry a transponder.  
3 So in that case the lane would be posted as being FasTrak  
4 only. Now there will be signage posted along the way that  
5 would define what an HOV is and would indicate that they  
6 would probably not have to pay a toll.

7 Now the toll. I should note as well that on the  
8 El Monte bus way, Interstate 10, during a part of the day,  
9 during the morning and afternoon peak hours, they have a  
10 three person requirement. Two person HOVs would be allowed  
11 to buy in and use the lane during that time of the day. And  
12 the tolls would be posted on changeable message elements. I  
13 didn't provide any of that in these, in these samples. But  
14 the tolls would be displayed at each point of ingress and  
15 egress to the facility so people would know how much it  
16 would cost to use the lane at that time.

17 Finally I do want to speak on what our evaluation  
18 plan would be. The whole concept of express lanes is new to  
19 many folks in Southern California. We have heard it said  
20 that there are people who live in Los Angeles who have never  
21 seen the ocean. Well I'm sure there are people in Southern  
22 California who might have heard of the 91 express lanes but  
23 have never driven it. So this whole idea of a toll facility  
24 in the middle of general purpose freeway lanes is new to  
25 them. So there is going to be an extensive amount of public

1 outreach and public follow-up.

2           And LA Metro together with Caltrans District 7  
3 will be conducting extensive follow-up surveys. Those  
4 follow-up surveys will probably include questions about  
5 whether people understand what the term HOV means. Whether  
6 they understand what the color purple means. And whether  
7 they understand what express lanes mean.

8           And I want to point out to the Committee that it's  
9 important to note that market penetration for this sort of  
10 thing builds up over time. So we probably can't expect to  
11 see immediate responses, immediate understanding right away.  
12 People are going to have to get used to this. And there  
13 will be a lot, as I indicated there will be a lot of public  
14 outreach going into this going forward. So we are going to  
15 try and educate the public as much as we can on the concept.  
16 And hopefully once the project gets up and running we should  
17 have, people should have a pretty good idea of who can and  
18 who can't use the facility.

19           And with that I'd be happy to take your questions.

20           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. You  
21 mentioned all of the projects that I know of in California  
22 except I-15 in San Diego. Do you know how they have signed  
23 I-15 in San Diego? They opened a four-and-a-half mile  
24 segment I think three months ago. They have the same thing.  
25 It's a toll lane but the HOV can ride for free.

1           MR. ROUSE: I-15 is signed as a facility that uses  
2 both the diamond and the FasTrak symbols. So it's  
3 indicating that people who are carpools can use the facility  
4 as well as people with FasTrak.

5           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: But they are not  
6 using these signs.

7           MR. ROUSE: They are not using these signs.

8           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

9           MR. ROUSE: Again, it's important to note this a  
10 very recent development as far as federal policy is  
11 concerned.

12          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. And if this  
13 goes through then they have to change the signs in District  
14 11 also?

15          MR. ROUSE: It is likely that they would have to  
16 change the signs and that they would have to implement this  
17 as part of any future high occupancy toll lane projects.

18          I also want to point out that based on what we are  
19 requesting experimentation from here w have been working on  
20 a statewide business plan to help guide us, meaning  
21 Caltrans, in the development of express lanes and how to  
22 better manage the HOV system. We have worked with local  
23 agencies including LA Metro and SANDAG and other regional  
24 transportation agencies in developing that plan.

25          We have identified several areas that need to be

1 focused on as we move forward with developing express lanes.  
2 One of those is signage. And so it is likely based on  
3 whether approval of experimentation is granted today, that  
4 we will probably come back to the Committee in the not-to-  
5 distant future with a signage package that would be applied  
6 to express lanes statewide.

7           Parsons Brinckerhoff is represented here today and  
8 their representative will be working with me and with the  
9 folks at headquarters, other folks at headquarters from  
10 Wayne's group, to review proposed signage and to put  
11 something together for the Committee. I am not sure at this  
12 point when that would be ready. I am hopeful it would  
13 happen by the end of this year but that is just my  
14 speculation. Again, we have to see how everything else  
15 turns out.

16           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you for a very  
17 informative presentation.

18           Any questions, members? Mr. Fisher and then  
19 Chief.

20           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, just a  
21 clarification. You handed out this sheet which says that  
22 the express lanes are open to FasTrak users only.

23           MR. ROUSE: Correct.

24           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But in the  
25 drawings here it shows FasTrak and HOV too.

1           MR. ROUSE: Okay. The distinction is because at  
2 that point in time when those earlier drawings were  
3 developed there was still a debate as to whether or not HOV  
4 users would be required to have FasTrak. The other material  
5 that I handed there with the purple was also to show the use  
6 of the purple in these signs. So it's two-fold.

7           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So you must have  
8 a FasTrak device, whether you are a HOV or not.

9           MR. ROUSE: That is -- I believe LA Metro could  
10 probably speak better to that but that is, my understanding  
11 is that is what they are considering, yes.

12          COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. My only  
13 comment, and I fully support the project, is that when you  
14 use the FasTrak logo in a compressed form it's kind of hard  
15 to read, like in the gray shown here. Whereas here where  
16 the format allows the larger logo and the larger letters  
17 then it's more readily read.

18          MR. ROUSE: And we have received the same comment  
19 from FHWA.

20          COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

21          MR. ROUSE: And that is something that we will  
22 focus on as we further refine these signs.

23          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any more questions?  
24 Chief.

25          COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I just have a couple.

1 So this is described as an experiment. And the way I  
2 understood from your presentation, the only mechanism you  
3 have to determine whether whatever it is you are trying to  
4 measure is effective is through the use of surveys.

5 MR. ROUSE: That's what we are looking at at this  
6 time, yes.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: And I understand the  
8 business plan isn't completed yet, that's still being worked  
9 on. And obviously these issues are still in flux if we are  
10 getting amendments to the proposed signs right now. And if  
11 the business plan is anticipated to be completed by the end  
12 of the year I guess I am having a hard time understanding  
13 what the purpose is of an experiment.

14 I'm not seeing how we are really going to gauge  
15 whatever it is you are trying to measure. And then if we  
16 are still defining what is actually going to be on these  
17 signs does this have any value? Or do we need to figure out  
18 what we are trying to do and then approve what the signs are  
19 going to look like?

20 MR. ROUSE: Well, I would have to disagree with  
21 you on that. It is pretty well set which way we are going  
22 to go. And I apologize for what appears to be a last-minute  
23 change. I had to speak with FHWA prior to coming to this  
24 meeting in order to get clarification. I finally was able  
25 to sit down with them last week. I had not had an



1 opportunity to talk with them prior to getting this package  
2 put together.

3 But here are the three things that are going to be  
4 consistent statewide. First is the use of the term "express  
5 lanes." Second is the use of the term "HOV." And thirdly  
6 is going to be the use of the color purple. Those will all  
7 be consistent throughout with all of these signs.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: So is that a need for  
9 an experiment or is that just a request to change what the  
10 signs are going to look like? What are we trying to do with  
11 an experiment?

12 MR. ROUSE: That's a --

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You're recommending  
14 that you are putting these at 80 installations, right?  
15 Close to 80?

16 MR. ROUSE: Approximately, yes.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I would be very  
18 surprised if you go back and change 80 installations. So  
19 what I'm seeing, an experimentation is that you put a few  
20 here and there and you try it in different regions and then  
21 we come back and you say, okay, the folks in Sacramento  
22 understood it but in San Diego they didn't understand it.  
23 But 80 locations is pretty much you're just changing the  
24 signs. So maybe --

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Do you want to move it

1 to action item?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No, I'm agreeing  
3 with what the Chief is saying. Is that this is beyond the  
4 scope of experimentation here if you are doing statewide 80  
5 installations.

6 Yes, Mr. Fisher.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I would just add  
8 that they are proposing new terminology and new colors that  
9 don't exist today. They are proposing a new standard. Yes,  
10 they are calling it an experiment but I think you have to  
11 invent something new for this new concept.

12 For example the word "express lane" where before  
13 we used to say carpool lanes or HOV lanes. That told you  
14 who could use it. Express lanes tells you how it's going to  
15 perform. So I think they are trying to get across a new  
16 concept. And then the purple is to be associated with the  
17 FasTrak detection, correct me if I'm wrong.

18 MR. ROUSE: With the toll lane, yes.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So yes, I think  
20 they're inventing new colors and new terminology because of  
21 this new concept.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The purple is  
23 already there. They are using it in toll roads in Orange  
24 County.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Yes, I understand why

1 they are doing it. It makes perfect sense and we are trying  
2 to be in conformance with what the feds are trying to do  
3 nationwide. I get that. But I guess I just don't see how  
4 this is not just, you know -- Wanting to change the  
5 terminology, okay that's fine. But what is this experiment  
6 and then how does it end and then how do we go from there?

7 MR. ROUSE: I'll be honest with you. As we sat  
8 down and thought about this it was a little difficult to try  
9 to figure out how to monitor it. That's been a concern of  
10 mine as we have gone forward with this.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: But does it really  
12 matter if we are monitoring it? If the national terminology  
13 is going to be express lanes instead of carpool then what  
14 are we trying to monitor? That's what they are called. And  
15 it doesn't matter whether you understand the terminology or  
16 not, if you are not in compliance you are going to get a  
17 ticket. So I don't know, what do you monitor?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I'll be surprised to  
19 see how you want measure its effectiveness. I mean, you can  
20 do phone surveys and just do before/after to see if people  
21 understand.

22 MR. ROUSE: I will defer to the Committee as to  
23 how you handle this. I do need to point out though that  
24 there is a very strict time schedule for implementing this  
25 project. As I indicated there's over \$200 million in

1 federal money waiting to be used. And this project has to  
2 be up in operation by the end of 2010. So I'm hoping that  
3 will not be a hindrance.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, thank you. If  
5 you guys don't have any more questions I need to see if  
6 anybody from the audience wishes to speak on this issue.

7 Seeing no hands, close it, bring it back. So what  
8 is your pleasure? What do you want to do with this? We can  
9 go either way.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Mr. Chairman?

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Mansourian.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I really like what  
13 Robert was talking about. I mean, it makes a lot of sense.  
14 So I think here is the idea. Devinder came up with it. So  
15 if it's good it's his, if not it's mine.

16 (Laughter.)

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It cannot possibly  
18 be good, you never have any good ideas.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I think we should  
20 move on with approving the recommendation -- approve the  
21 experimentation. Get the letter from FHWA about the color  
22 schemes and the words then bring it back as an action item.  
23 This way we have got you on the road, you don't have to  
24 wait. And then when it comes back we have approved it as a  
25 sign and other people don't need to go through

1 experimentation.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There's no other  
3 people, it's just Caltrans.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Well, but other  
5 people in --

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: In case you want to  
7 have express toll lanes on arterials.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: San Jose has many  
9 expressways, LA has many expressways.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No, no, no. The way  
11 that they are -- These express lanes are toll lanes.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I know, we're  
13 looking at money. See Laura, I'm trying to make money for  
14 you.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Someday we'll have  
16 toll lanes on residential streets.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So that's my  
18 suggestion.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, so there is a  
20 suggestion. Is that, is that going to work for you?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: It will work for us,  
22 yes.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It's going to work  
24 for Caltrans.

25 Chief, does it address your concern?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: That's fine.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So you want to make  
3 a motion?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: You want to open --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I opened it, there  
6 were no questions.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I recommend we  
8 approve the experimentation and request this comes back as  
9 an action item after we receive the FHWA letter approval of  
10 the sign and verbiage and all that for a future agenda.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There's a motion, is  
12 there a second.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Second.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Motion and second.  
15 Discussion? Yes, Mr. Fisher.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm not  
17 understanding. If we approve it that's an action, right?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: We are approving it  
19 as experiment because that's what it was agendized.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Then what is the  
21 action item that would come before us?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: That we are  
23 approving the color scheme and the wordings.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: If FHWA and Caltrans  
25 are changing HOV lane and the color schemes and all of that

1 as new signs it needs to come back before us anyway.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's right.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But wouldn't we  
4 want to get the results of the experiment?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, because the  
6 federal government has made this decision, period. That's  
7 why I'm saying, let's get that letter. If this is the color  
8 scheme.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: This is just a formality  
10 to --

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Has that been  
12 finally approved by the feds?

13 MR. ROUSE: No. These changes -- You are probably  
14 aware that there is an NPA out for a new MUTCD. And this,  
15 the NPA incorporates proposed signage for what they term,  
16 managed lanes. In developing that NPA the folks from FHWA  
17 went around and did a scan tour and consulted with different  
18 states as to some of the best practices. And as a result  
19 what is currently shown in the NPA is not what is looking to  
20 be proposed.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: What is NPA, I'm  
22 sorry?

23 MR. ROUSE: NPA, Notice of Proposed Amendment, I'm  
24 sorry. Yes, NPA, Notice of Proposed Amendment, it's a  
25 federal term. So what is shown in that NPA, what is

1 proposed for the new version of the MUTCD is actually not  
2 what they are looking at going forward.

3 The direction I received from FHWA is that this is  
4 guidance in the absence of a standard. Now it is most  
5 likely that I could obtain a letter from Kevin Sylvester  
6 with FHWA in Washington who is spearheading this effort. I  
7 could probably get a letter from him stating what they are  
8 looking to see. I don't think that would be difficult to  
9 do. And we could present that to the Committee at the same  
10 time that we develop a final sign package for the entire  
11 state. Which is what I am assuming you are proposing. If I  
12 was to come back for an action item it would be in that  
13 form.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, no, no. Maybe  
15 I'm confusing you. Because this is agendized as an  
16 experimentation as opposed to an action item, so the only  
17 action we can officially take is an experimentation.

18 MR. ROUSE: Correct.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So my motion is to  
20 recommend -- my motion is to approve that.

21 But I'm saying if, when you have that letter which  
22 has finalized all of this, this needs to come back to us for  
23 permanent signing anyway. So I am not relating the two  
24 together, I am only following what Chief Maynard was saying  
25 because that makes sense.



1 MR. ROUSE: Okay.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: But the only action  
3 before us is approve or not approve experimentation.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You are recommending  
5 we approve the experimentation.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Experimentation,  
7 correct.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: However, it's a kind  
9 of unusual experimentation because the federal government is  
10 going to approve this anyway so you have to incorporate it  
11 into the manual. So when it's approved your experimentation  
12 is done.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I thought the  
14 process was once the feds adopt something in the new MUTCD  
15 the state has two years to then decide if it wants to adopt  
16 it. So I think in the course of doing our work we are going  
17 to adopt something in any event, and it will be what the  
18 feds adopt I presume. So until that time this is an  
19 experiment. Until such time that a national standard is  
20 adopted and the state then takes action on it.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: We are all saying  
22 the same thing.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And you realize that  
24 if the feds change either of these, which I'd be surprised,  
25 they wouldn't probably, it's not a controversial item. But

1 if they change it then you have to change all these 80  
2 signs.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Mr. Chairman?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: That's correct.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well why can't we  
7 approve the signs pending the FHWA letter being submitted to  
8 the Committee?

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: well we can't  
10 approve the signs today because it's not an action item, we  
11 can only approve experimentation.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But you can change it.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, we're just talking  
14 about approving this experiment. That's all we're talking  
15 about. And based on this experiment they may tweak it a  
16 little bit and we may see something else, you know, a year  
17 from now.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Make a motion.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I did. My motion  
20 was, my motion was to approve the experimentation.

21 MR. ROUSE: I would like to point --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: A side discussion is  
23 just side discussion.

24 MR. ROUSE: I would like to point out.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Hold on, hold on a

1 second. There's a motion, is there a second?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I second.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, a motion and a  
4 second. Let me see if anybody has any questions.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Don't talk us out of  
6 it.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Do you guys want any  
8 discussion on this or we just go and listen? Okay, go  
9 ahead.

10 MR. ROUSE: I would like to point out that it is  
11 most likely that we will be developing something based on  
12 the federal standards prior to the formal adoption of the  
13 next version of the MUTCD. So we're a little ahead of the  
14 gun. The reason why is because of the urgency for the need  
15 of getting the signage standards implemented for the entire  
16 state, thank you.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, motion and a  
18 second. No discussion?

19 Let's vote. All those in favor?

20 (Ayes.)

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

22 The motion passes.

23 For those of you who are getting hungry let's  
24 finish 09-14 then we'll break half an hour for lunch. And  
25 then we'll come back and finish the rest of the agenda.

1 Yes, no? Yes? Okay. Because 09-14 has the same people. I  
2 just don't want to keep them waiting.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: This is a little  
4 different situation though. We're talking about basically  
5 buses on the shoulders there and then marking the shoulder  
6 as a transit lane. I think Joe is going to explain that to  
7 us.

8 MR. ROUSE: That's why I said hopefully this is a  
9 little bit more straightforward. About five years ago there  
10 was a joint project developed between San Diego Association  
11 of Governments, the San Diego Metropolitan Transportation  
12 System and Caltrans District 11 that allowed for buses to  
13 use the right hand shoulder of a segment of State Route 52  
14 and Interstate 805 in the north portion of the city.

15 And now SANDAG and the Metropolitan Transportation  
16 System are looking to apply this same concept, but this time  
17 on the median shoulders of about a 20 mile stretch of  
18 Interstate 805, so most of the length of the freeway. And I  
19 believe they are receiving a grant from the Federal Transit  
20 Administration to cover this.

21 Basically what is happening here is they are  
22 converting the inside shoulder to what is called a transit  
23 only lane because CVC prohibits vehicles from driving in the  
24 shoulder. So they are actually identifying this as a lane.  
25 It is physically being rebuilt. They are going to gut it

1 and put in a new structural section that can accommodate  
2 buses. These buses will have special collision avoidance  
3 equipment and monitoring equipment so that they can safely  
4 enter and exit the lanes.

5           The numbers that I have received indicate that  
6 there will be about 24 trips per day in each direction; 10  
7 of those trips during the peak period. Buses will have  
8 about a 15 minute frequency during the peak period and a  
9 half-hour frequency during the off-peak. And the service is  
10 only going to happen during the weekdays.

11           Now these buses will not be using the shoulder all  
12 the time. They will only be able to use it when traffic  
13 speeds are below 35 miles an hour in the general purpose  
14 lanes and these buses won't travel at more than 35 miles an  
15 hour, or 10 miles an hour faster than the adjacent traffic,  
16 whichever is less.

17           Again with these signs the signage is non-standard  
18 for California. They took standard HOV signage and modified  
19 it slightly. They removed the diamond and they incorporated  
20 the federal standard for buses using the front of the  
21 transit bus in lieu of a diamond. And they replaced the  
22 term "carpool" with "transit." Other than that these look  
23 like our standard carpool lanes that we have in California  
24 right now.

25           The federal MUTCD provides signage standards for

1 bus lanes but those were not adopted for use in California,  
2 as I'm sure you are aware. And furthermore SANDAG and the  
3 Metropolitan Transportation System felt that the use of the  
4 term "transit" was needed instead of "bus" in order to make  
5 it clear that this facility was strictly for their vehicles,  
6 not for school buses or tour buses or things like that.

7 Again in this case I had a little difficult time  
8 trying to figure out how we could monitor this type of  
9 project. But I believe the best way is to work with the  
10 area offices of the California Highway Patrol to obtain  
11 violation numbers and to just keep track of it that way.

12 And I should note that this project will be in  
13 place for about two years. There is a plan to come through  
14 and completely reconstruct Interstate 805 in this area to  
15 provide four managed lanes very similar to what has been  
16 done and is being done right now on Interstate 15.

17 And with that.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

19 Questions? Any questions?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I just want to confirm,  
21 I believe I know the answer to this. But the CHP has been  
22 working with SANDAG on this particular project in addition  
23 to the other HOT lane issues that are going down there; is  
24 that correct?

25 MR. ROUSE: I am not certain of that. But I would

1 hope they would be.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I have been working  
3 with them also.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I thought so.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Great. Any other  
6 questions?

7 Any member of the audience?

8 Hearing none, closing. Do I have a motion?

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Move approval of  
10 the experiment.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There's a motion.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Second.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There's a second.

14 Discussion?

15 Seeing none, all those in favor?

16 (Ayes.)

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition? The  
18 motion passes unanimously.

19 Colleagues, it is now 10 to 1 with my watch.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Mr. Chairman, may I make  
21 a motion to go for lunch?

22 (Laughter.)

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You may not get a  
24 second, watch it. You know, it happened to me once.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I'm used to it.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So let's be back  
2 here at 1:20. Because we have a couple of members that they  
3 have flights they have to catch, we want to finish early.  
4 So 1:20 we will reconvene.

5 (Thereupon, the lunch recess was taken  
6 off the record.)

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, let's call the  
8 meeting back to order. And as I said we have a couple of  
9 members who need to leave by 2:30. My goal is to finish by  
10 then or before then.

11 Okay, the next item, Mr. Henley, is Item 09-15,  
12 non-standard --

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Do you want to call  
14 him?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes, call him.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: What's that?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well that or we'll just  
18 take them out of order. Is Lissner here?

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No, Lissner is not  
20 here.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Ted Lengel, he's here.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: He is going to talk  
24 about this.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And Ted has given us



1 some report that you all have a copy. It came in that  
2 manila envelope. Non-standard traffic control devices on  
3 public roadways.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay well --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: What's the story  
6 with that?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Of course, you don't  
8 have a jurisdiction as far as -- but I know Caltrans is  
9 seeing a lot of --

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: If you don't have  
11 jurisdiction why are you bringing it to us?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Because some of us do.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We can talk about  
14 world peace and all --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: That's what this is  
16 about, world peace.

17 Anyway there's, you know, concern that, you know,  
18 we are in the business of setting standards for public  
19 roadways and there are people ignoring our standards. So we  
20 are going to have a couple of people here to talk to us  
21 about some of the situations where they found that the  
22 standards aren't being followed. And then I think the  
23 question is, what are we going to do about it or are we  
24 going to do anything?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a fact that

1   there are some cities and some counties that are using non-  
2   standard traffic control devices?

3               COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY:   Yes.

4               COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:   And what is this  
5   Committee expected to do?

6               COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY:   Yes, or do we want to do  
7   anything.

8               COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:   Well the Committee  
9   is not enforcement.   At best it can advise California.

10              COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY:   Well yes, that's what  
11   they need to do is advise.

12              COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:   Okay, so who does  
13   what?   Do you have a presentation?

14              COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY:   Ted, you want to talk  
15   first since Bob is not here right now.   He is going to talk  
16   on it also.

17              COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:   I'd appreciate if  
18   you limit your comments to five minutes.

19              MR. LENGEL:   That's why I was writing.

20              COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:   Thank you.

21              MR. LENGEL:   Unless you ask me questions.   I'm Ted  
22   Lengel.   I am a retired engineering assistant from the  
23   transportation and development department of the City of  
24   Pomona.   And that was quite a few years ago, about three  
25   years ago.

1           Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee and  
2 Mr. Singh, I thank you for the opportunity to speak to the  
3 Committee today. I have sent advance copies of the report,  
4 which I placed on your desk, to Mr. Singh, the city managers  
5 of Claremont, La Verne and San Dimas, and the senior civil  
6 engineer of the City of Pomona. Also to the Federal Highway  
7 Commission -- the Federal Highway Administration in  
8 Washington DC, and to the Caltrans District 7 director.

9           If a picture is worth 1,000 words then my report  
10 would be at least 100,000 words long and I can't do that in  
11 five minutes. The pictures that are in the book clearly  
12 illustrate a problem that you address in your agenda on page  
13 42 and I quote you:

14                        "If a public agency discovers an  
15                        unauthorized traffic control device on one of  
16                        its streets or highways it clearly has the  
17                        authority to remove the device and seek civil  
18                        or criminal action against the perpetrator."

19           But what if a public agency itself chooses to  
20 install a non-compliant traffic control device? Neither the  
21 US Code nor California law specifies the penalties for a  
22 public agency violating the prohibition against placement of  
23 non-compliant traffic control devices. Nor delegates to any  
24 state agency authority to enforce the prohibition.  
25 Currently the only recourse is through another agency or a

1 member of the public taking legal action.

2           You further say despite the prohibition against  
3 placement of non-compliant traffic control devices, even a  
4 cursory inspection of streets and highways in California  
5 reveals a large number of non-compliant traffic control  
6 devices. This lack of conformity is undesirable for reasons  
7 given in the introduction to the California MUTCD.

8           What a paradox we have here. If a private  
9 individual or a company places an unauthorized, and I am  
10 going to add illegal to that unauthorized because an  
11 unauthorized sign is illegal according to the California  
12 statutes. If a private individual were to place an  
13 unauthorized sign or illegal sign on a city street or  
14 highway a public agency can remove the device and seek  
15 criminal or civil actions. But if a public agency places an  
16 illegal sign basically nothing can be done.

17           Your statement that currently the only recourse is  
18 through another agency or a member of the public taking  
19 legal action is not entirely correct. You have already  
20 cited Section 21400 and 21401(a) of the California Vehicle  
21 Code which makes it illegal to install signs that do not  
22 conform to the adopted MUTCD. Now let's read Section 21465  
23 and 21467. Section 21465 says:

24                       "No person shall place, maintain or  
25                       display upon or in view of any highway any

1           unofficial sign, signal device or marking or  
2           any sign, signal device or marking which  
3           purports to be or is an imitation of or  
4           resembles an official traffic control device,  
5           or which attempts to direct the movement of  
6           traffic, or which hides from view any  
7           official traffic control device."

8   And then in 21467 it says:

9                   "Every prohibited sign, signal device or  
10           light is a public nuisance and the Department  
11           of Transportation, members of the California  
12           Highway Patrol and the local authorities are  
13           hereby authorized --"

14   Listen to these words.

15                   "-- and empowered without notice to  
16           remove the same or cause the same to be  
17           removed. Or the director of transportation,  
18           the commissioner or local authorities may  
19           bring an action as provided by law to abate  
20           such a nuisance."

21           Wow. This says that prohibited signs are a public  
22   nuisance and the CHP and local authorities are authorized  
23   and empowered to remove them. And if they don't the  
24   director of transportation may bring a legal action to have  
25   them removed. So the penalty is that the cities would have

1 to remove these illegal signs.

2 Now in Claremont they have an ordinance that gives  
3 the city traffic engineer authority to remove any traffic  
4 control device not specifically required by the Vehicle  
5 Code. Excuse me.

6 But what if for political reasons these public  
7 officials are unwilling or reluctant to enforce the law? I  
8 am going to suggest a show-cause hearing. Anyone can file  
9 an action in superior court, or municipal court as a matter  
10 of fact, and require the director to appear and show cause  
11 as to why he should not use the power and authority already  
12 given by the California Vehicle Code Section 21467 to abate  
13 a public nuisance.

14 It wouldn't be hard to prove that these signs  
15 qualified as a public nuisance under the law. And it would  
16 be interesting to see how the director would explain to a  
17 judge that he couldn't abate a nuisance because he didn't  
18 have the power or authority to do so.

19 Even on a local level someone could file an action  
20 in superior court or municipal court and require the city  
21 traffic engineer of the City of Claremont, for example, to  
22 remove the traffic control devices that are not specifically  
23 required by the Vehicle Code. It would be interesting to  
24 see how the city traffic engineer would explain to a judge  
25 that he couldn't remove those signs that are not

1 specifically required by the CVC because he didn't have the  
2 authority to do so.

3 I was going to say ladies and gentlemen but I  
4 think I should say lady and gentlemen of the California  
5 Traffic Control Devices Committee. You have a big and ever-  
6 expanding problem in California. Sign companies are  
7 actively soliciting cities throughout the state to install  
8 these non-conforming signs. It's getting out of control, as  
9 you have already mentioned. And soon this situation will  
10 come to the attention of the FHWA or else someone is going  
11 to take Caltrans to court.

12 I think that a subcommittee that you mentioned  
13 would be a big waste of time and energy. By the time a  
14 subcommittee recommended appropriate action 50 more cities  
15 will have signs installed. And what good would it do to  
16 recommend a course of action that Caltrans is unwilling to  
17 take? Caltrans has the statutory power and authority to  
18 immediately put a halt to this problem and reverse the  
19 damage already done.

20 You only need the will to do it, and there is no  
21 pun intended to Mr. Kempton, by the way. Again, you already  
22 have -- somebody got a laugh out of that one. Again, you  
23 already have the statutory power and authority to solve this  
24 problem. You only need the will to do it because Caltrans,  
25 you have a problem.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you,  
2 Mr. Lengel, I appreciate it. First of all let me thank you  
3 for this very well-prepared document.

4 MR. LENGEL: Thank you.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I for one appreciate  
6 it. It shows a lot of effort and costs associated with  
7 preparing this. So I understand where this comes from and I  
8 have a copy of your letter to Director Kempton and then the  
9 reply signed by Mr. Copp on March 25, '09. I am not just  
10 sure -- again, you know, I'll hold judgment on that one. I  
11 am not just sure what specifically the Devices Committee can  
12 do with that regard.

13 On the legal issue, I am definitely not qualified  
14 to whether Caltrans can do anything about it or not. Just  
15 to give you an idea for example. We pass standards for  
16 minimum yellow timing. And if a local agency does not  
17 comply with that minimum yellow timing there is not really  
18 anything that we can do, that Caltrans do.

19 A motorist that gets a ticket can go and challenge  
20 the yellow timing in a court and adjudicate it through the  
21 judiciary but -- I'll hold judgment on that to hear from  
22 other colleagues. I am just -- I am not still clear what we  
23 are expected to do. Wait a minute. So let me finish the  
24 presentation and discussion and then I'll open it to the  
25 public and I will invite you to come back, thank you.



1           Mr. Henley, is there anyone else that is  
2   presenting on this?

3           COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY:  Yes, Bob Shanteau is  
4   going to talk.

5           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:  Okay.  Mr. Shanteau,  
6   I'd appreciate it also if you can limit your comments to  
7   five minutes.

8           DR. SHANTEAU:  The computer.

9           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:  Pardon?

10          DR. SHANTEAU:  I need the computer, Devinder.

11          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI:  Fine, use the  
12   computer.

13          DR. SHANTEAU:  I have my, I have my presentation  
14   on the thumb drive, it's all set up.  All Devinder has to do  
15   is log on.

16                 It was actually my work with the California  
17   Association of Bicycling Organizations and transportation  
18   engineering that I was first brought to the attention that  
19   there are a lot of non-compliant traffic control devices in  
20   California.  And my presentation has photographs of a few  
21   and I hope you get a kick out of them.  I tried to include  
22   the funny ones.

23                 But basically, and also just so you know I wrote  
24   up what is in your agenda packet.  And it was my e-mail to  
25   Mr. Copp that he suggested, why don't we put this on the

1 CTCDC agenda, so that's where we are.

2 And then I should -- Devinder, down below. Just  
3 click on CTCDC on the Start line down at the bottom.

4 Bottom, bottom, bottom, there. And again. There you go.

5 And where is it? It looks like I'll have to take it.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: By the way, this is  
7 all counting against your time.

8 (Laughter.)

9 DR. SHANTEAU: Somebody removed my thumb drive.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Shanteau, if it  
11 takes time, I think all the members of the committee  
12 stipulate that there are many illegal traffic control  
13 devices all over California. We don't really need to see  
14 the pictures.

15 DR. SHANTEAU: It's not all that I'm showing. I  
16 was all set up and --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: There we go.

18 DR. SHANTEAU: Okay, let me -- and the title of my  
19 talk. Next slide.

20 Okay, so we know what we are talking about here.  
21 This is straight out of the California MUTCD with the US  
22 Code and the two Vehicle Code sections. And thank you very  
23 much for pointing out those others. I knew I had seen those  
24 other two. Where did he go, the man who just spoke? There  
25 you are. I knew I had seen those other two somewhere. I

1 was wondering where they were, thank you very much.

2 Right where the other gentleman left off. And I  
3 was told by an attorney that the only thing that a private  
4 party can do is file an injunctive lawsuit. You just  
5 pointed out something else, okay, and I thank you very much  
6 for that. An injunctive lawsuit, I was told that it would  
7 cost 20,000 or more in attorney's fees and those fees are  
8 not recoverable from the losing party. So even if as a  
9 private party I do succeed in a lawsuit, in an injunctive  
10 lawsuit against a public agency, I'm out the money. Go  
11 ahead, next.

12 So we are dealing here with basically the issue.  
13 Now to get down to philosophy again, what is the proper role  
14 of government? Is it a proper role of government to enforce  
15 the MUTCD? After all, where would the airports be if they  
16 weren't regulated? If there were no enforcement of signing  
17 and striping on airports. Can you imagine if that was self-  
18 enforced like the MUTCD is.

19 And in fact the Caltrans aeronautics division does  
20 enforce airport standards, the FAA standards in California.  
21 They do license airports, they do control the money, and  
22 they can file lawsuits to close an airport down or force it  
23 to pay money to correct a situation. Or more likely an  
24 injunctive lawsuit to force it to change. But can you  
25 imagine if an airport put up one of these signs that I'm

1 about to show you. Go ahead.

2 And so now we are getting into the examples.

3 These are from around California. Most of these photographs

4 I did not take. Ridiculous examples. That's what I've

5 said, these are funny right? That's a funny one. Go ahead,

6 next.

7 Did you know that the arrows above the directional

8 signs like that are not allowed? Keep going.

9 Sorry, I didn't mean to pick on anybody in

10 particular, okay. Not so fast, Devinder. I didn't mean to

11 pick on anybody in particular. But some of these signs have

12 city names on them so I can't, I cannot avoid it.

13 Did you know that -- I learned when I was -- I

14 think you have to back up one or two more, Devinder, please.

15 Back up. Back, back, you're going the wrong way. The other

16 button. Back. The right hand button. And you want to go

17 back then. Keep going, okay.

18 Like I said, a lot of these signs have city names

19 on them so you can't avoid showing that -- you went too far.

20 Next. Okay. That's a case where you have what I would

21 interpret to be the correct sign, the upper one, and the

22 incorrect sign below.

23 Did you know that no turn on red in words is no

24 longer allowed in the California MUTCD? It now has to be a

25 symbol sign. You saw an example of one of those earlier

1 today during the -- Kang Hu's presentation. Keep going.

2 And by the way, that sign was installed about two years ago.

3 Did you know that the two way plaque doesn't exist  
4 in the California MUTCD? You can only have three-way, four-  
5 way or all-way. Keep going.

6 And you aren't supposed to have any other sign,  
7 except perhaps a street name sign, on a stop sign pole. I  
8 was told by -- when I worked for the City of Monterey I was  
9 told that by the very helpful review team from UC Berkeley.  
10 If I were still working for a local agency I'd have them out  
11 about every five years to review our traffic engineering and  
12 traffic safety programs. Keep going.

13 A stop sign on a bus stop sign? Not allowed.  
14 Keep going.

15 This is the one that finally got me over the edge.  
16 That is not allowed on two fronts. One is, do you see the  
17 bicycle? Do you recognize that as a bicyclist symbol on top  
18 above the car? That was supposed to be subject to testing.  
19 This sign went to the California Bicycle Advisory Committee,  
20 which said, okay test it and bring it back. Test it human  
21 factors testing in a lab. The next thing we know it's up in  
22 the street.

23 And the bikes in lane is also not allowed. That's  
24 wording on a warning sign in California. You cannot make up  
25 your own wording on a warning sign. Even though it's in the

1 federal MUTCD that you can, in the California MUTCD you  
2 cannot. Keep going.

3 The same kind of thing. Even though the symbol is  
4 okay, the bicycle symbol, the wording is not.

5 Obviously -- I personally don't have any problem  
6 with this particular sign if it were the subject of an  
7 experimentation. The previous sign I do have some problem  
8 with. Next, Devinder.

9 So what's the recommendation? My recommendation  
10 was to appoint a subcommittee but of course that was before  
11 the previous speaker pointed out Vehicle Code Section --  
12 what was it, 21465 and 21467.

13 And I have been told, because I have been told  
14 repeatedly by folks at Caltrans they don't have the  
15 authority to enforce the MUTCD. I don't know, maybe, maybe  
16 they do. Maybe what the Committee wants to do is ask  
17 Caltrans -- direct Caltrans to ask Caltrans legal for an  
18 opinion. Does Caltrans have the authority to enforce the  
19 MUTCD on every road on which the MUTCD applies in  
20 California.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you,  
22 Mr. Shanteau. Again, thank you for your effort putting the  
23 presentation together.

24 That's it as far as presentations?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: As far as I know, yes.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. So before I  
2 open it to anyone else, colleagues here, do you have any  
3 questions for the two speakers or any thoughts on this?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: After the public  
5 hearing.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: After the public.  
7 Let's see who from the public wants to speak on this. The  
8 gentleman over there I think.

9 MR. ARRULA: I did have good morning earlier but  
10 now we're on to afternoon. So good afternoon, Honorable --  
11 I should say mayor. Honorable Chair and members of the  
12 Committee. I'm used to going before a City Council, as you  
13 can imagine. And also thank you for the opportunity to come  
14 speak with you today this process and discussion of this  
15 issue. My name is Damien Arrula. I am the economic  
16 development officer with the City of Claremont.

17 I am also here to represent the cities of San  
18 Dimas and La Verne with respect to this issue and Mr.  
19 Lengel's initial report on way finding signage. And with  
20 respect to bringing focus to the issue in particular as it  
21 relates to the cities of Claremont, La Verne, Pomona and San  
22 Dimas is, in Mr. Lengel's initial request, is that we are  
23 focusing and discussing more how way finding signage and how  
24 it relates to a community's character and its ability to  
25 ensure that residents are able to access certain

1 destinations within a community.

2           What I would like to do is actually just read  
3 briefly a letter from our city manager. And I have copies  
4 for the Committee Members that I could share with you and  
5 also highlight a couple of points that I'd like to point out  
6 with regards to the discussion that's occurred up to this  
7 point.

8           The City of Claremont has reviewed the assertions  
9 regarding the installation of directional signs in the city  
10 of Claremont, the city of Pomona, the cities of La Verne and  
11 San Dimas, and believes the claims regarding way finding and  
12 other directional signs need to be carefully considered in  
13 their local context.

14           California Vehicle Code 21351 states local  
15 authorities in their respective jurisdictions shall place  
16 and maintain, or cause to be placed and maintain, such  
17 traffic signs, signals and other terrific control devices  
18 upon streets and highways as required hereunder. And may  
19 place and maintain, or cause to be placed and be maintained,  
20 such appropriate signs, signals or other traffic control  
21 devices as may be authorized hereunder. Or may be necessary  
22 to properly indicate and carry out the provisions of this  
23 code or local traffic ordinances or to warn or guide  
24 traffic.

25           Mr. Lengel had touched upon the fact that we have



1 a local traffic ordinance as well.

2 Local agencies are considered to have police  
3 powers and specific responsibilities over the right of way  
4 located within their own respective jurisdictions. Traffic  
5 control and way finding signage is a crucial part of these  
6 responsibilities. In the case specifically with the City of  
7 Claremont. The way finding signs in locations were removed  
8 and approved by the City's traffic engineer and the City  
9 Council prior to installation.

10 We appreciate your efforts regarding the manual on  
11 uniform traffic control devices revisions and are looking  
12 forward to a revision that incorporates local authority  
13 responsibilities regarding the wave finding signage issue.

14 And I would also like to just touch upon a couple  
15 of things that have been said with respect to way finding  
16 signs. I know this is obviously a much larger issue with  
17 respect to some of the signs that were discussed in a recent  
18 presentation.

19 But in terms of the way finding signage and as it  
20 relates to MUTCD in terms of non-compliance airports was one  
21 that was brought up. I'd like to just say that airports,  
22 actually most of the airports in the state of California.  
23 Not as it relates to obviously the runways and things that  
24 are of a safety nature.

25 But as it relates to directional signs and

1 actually getting people to and from destinations within the  
2 airport, have unique, branded signage related to that  
3 airport. And a sign that is maybe at Bob Hope Airport, it  
4 won't be the same at SFO, for example, or other airports.  
5 So I should point that out that there actually is different  
6 non-compliant, current signage that is branded and  
7 associated with those individual airports.

8 I would also like to point out several cities that  
9 actually were in the room earlier today. I am not sure if  
10 they are all here. But the cities of LA. There's actually  
11 some way finding signs right outside this building as a  
12 matter of fact. I saw a few of them on the way into LA.  
13 The city of San Jose, the cities of San Francisco, Long  
14 Beach and Sacramento even around Caltrans headquarters have  
15 way finding signage. And they just recently did a way  
16 finding signage program.

17 I would also like to point out that Washington DC  
18 recently started off with a very large way finding signage  
19 program, very comprehensive.

20 And the point I'm bringing up with respect to all  
21 these cities is not necessarily the fact that they just have  
22 non-conforming signs. It's the fact that the cities have  
23 taken an initiative to come up with signage they believe is  
24 reflective of their communities and also allow people at the  
25 same time to be able to access certain destinations within

1 their community that are commonplace. So I would like to  
2 point that out.

3 And with respect to obviously the issue of just a  
4 blanket idea of non-conformance. As you can imagine cities,  
5 particularly like Washington DC and even the City of LA,  
6 cities, Sacramento. They have invested millions of dollars  
7 in these signs and throughout the past, you know, ten years  
8 or so.

9 I would also like to point out real briefly that  
10 in Mr. Lengel's request and other discussion that relates to  
11 some of the signage that he had pointed out in your report  
12 actually is pictures of pedestrian signs. So I want to make  
13 sure that there is a distinction there too because we do  
14 have pedestrian signage in our village. And the signage  
15 looks similar to some of the larger signs that are designed  
16 for vehicles to get them to our village and other historic  
17 points or destinations within the city that are branded,  
18 again, with the character and flavor of the city. So those  
19 aren't necessarily meant to be vehicular signs. They are  
20 not of the size and text of the font that we would prefer to  
21 have for vehicular sign when we consulted with our  
22 consultants on that. So I'd like to point those out too.

23 With respect to some of the discussion that's  
24 going on, you know, with FHWA and how it relates to some of  
25 these signs being considered experimental and how those are

1 technically approved being through experimental. I wanted  
2 to also point out that Hunt Design, which is our consultant  
3 but has been several cities' consultant, the city of LA, the  
4 city of Sacramento, actually submitted a letter which I'll  
5 also pass to you, that he made a couple of points.

6           And one of the things that he wanted to point out  
7 in that is that the national design organization, SEGD, has  
8 for the last two years been working with FHWA on  
9 modifications to MUTCD that will provide guidelines for  
10 community sign programs that are reflective of those  
11 communities. And it is expected a final version yet this  
12 year so cities can get their sign programs while at the same  
13 time meeting the MUTCD.

14           The last thing I would like to leave with you  
15 today and point out is that a lot of what we are talking  
16 about is what we consider official traffic control devices.  
17 So I guess a question beyond even some of the enforcement  
18 associated in the discussion that is going on with that is  
19 at what point do we determine that these are official  
20 traffic control devices? Insomuch as versus being a  
21 function of a community in trying to get people to certain  
22 community destination points. So that's the last thing I  
23 would like to leave with you today.

24           And I would be happy to answer any questions. But  
25 I do have the letters from the cities of Claremont, the

1 cities of San Dimas and La Verne. We unfortunately couldn't  
2 get one from Pomona in time but they did indicate they agree  
3 with the cities putting forth this matter before you and  
4 appreciating the opportunity to speak.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you very much.  
6 If you share copies of the letters with our secretary,  
7 Mr. Singh, to make sure that they are added to the records  
8 of the meeting.

9 Anybody else from the public who wishes to speak  
10 on this item? Chad. And I appreciate being brief. We are  
11 getting close to our limit time.

12 MR. DORNSIFE: Chad Dornsife, Best Highway Safety  
13 Practices Institute. This is pretty basic. We have 80,000  
14 entities in this country that all have the authority to  
15 place signs on public right of ways. And the reason we have  
16 a uniformity mandate is because travel is ubiquitous. And  
17 having white signs that do this and blue signs that do that  
18 and brown signs that do this and they are not legible at  
19 speed and they're -- are not allowed.

20 And there are procedures and practice in place to  
21 do it right. And the cities have chosen that they don't  
22 like that way, they want to do it their own way, and then  
23 they are here asking permission to violate the law. And  
24 quite frankly the MUTCD is there for a reason and I think it  
25 should be enforced.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

2 MR. DORNSIFE: That's it.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other members of  
4 the public? Seeing none I close it and bring it back to the  
5 Committee. There are actually three issues here. Some of  
6 the signs, you know, we change the MUTCD like any other  
7 manual and we update. So the cities are not expected each  
8 time that we do the MUTCD update they have to go back and  
9 change all the signs to make compliance. That's why we have  
10 a time line for compliance. So they have 10, 14, depending  
11 on the time of sign, to come to compliance with the latest.

12 The second one what is the definition of official  
13 traffic control device versus the community identification  
14 signs. Cities and communities use community ID signs. They  
15 have teams, colors and all that. They use it for way  
16 finding, they advertise for churches, they put the Rotary  
17 Club and Lions Club and all kinds of stuff. In my mind at  
18 least they are separate issues.

19 But the question in front of us I think is why is  
20 Caltrans bringing this for us? Because I think maybe --  
21 more important than anything in my mind is a legal question.  
22 Whether Caltrans has the authority to enforce MUTCD or we  
23 just establish the standards. And then it's upon the local  
24 jurisdiction, because they are government agencies also, to  
25 comply with the standards. And lack of compliance may

1 result in consequences.

2 I gave you the example of the yellow timing.

3 Caltrans cannot possibly go and make sure that the minimum  
4 yellow timing or the minimum intersection distance that they  
5 establish is complied with all over the state. It is the  
6 responsibility of the local government to comply with those  
7 standards.

8 In this case I think we are asked to we think it  
9 is something that we want to ask Caltrans to see even if  
10 they have the enforcement authority. And if they have the  
11 enforcement authority then what might be a good, workable  
12 mechanism. Somebody gave the example of FAA and the  
13 Division of Aeronautics.

14 What do we need to do, Mr. Babico?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: From my experience, I  
16 just want to share it with the panel and the public. That  
17 there are so many signs that are required by the CVC as well  
18 as by local state and highway codes that are not covered in  
19 the California MUTCD.

20 For example, for the county under local speed and  
21 highway, Section 954.5, it requires the counties when they  
22 delete any roads, they have to install a sign similar to  
23 this. This is not covered in Caltrans manual, okay.

24 The other one, California Vehicle Code. When you  
25 prohibit trucks there is three sections. It says, you will

1 allow exception to the prohibition of the roadway is the  
2 school buses, utilities, garbage collectors, fire engine  
3 trucks. These should be assigned as a supplement to the no  
4 trucks and they are not there.

5 My responsibility was to communicate with Caltrans  
6 and I did, and I'm working on that. So my issue is that  
7 there are some requirements by the California Vehicle Code,  
8 by the local agencies, local state and highway code, as well  
9 as the CVC, that they are not reflected in the California  
10 MUTCD. So what you do, you create what you need. That is  
11 one aspect.

12 The other aspect. In many cities and counties  
13 there are authority by ordinance or resolutions. Either the  
14 road commissioner or the city engineer, they have the  
15 discretionary power to allow and approve certain signs that  
16 is in need for their situation, which is not in the  
17 California MUTCD.

18 Similar case. When we had last year, I believe,  
19 from the City and County of San Francisco. There were  
20 probably 50 signs were unofficial and they brought it to our  
21 attention for processing. So there are these things  
22 happening.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: As I said, there are  
24 a variety of reasons why. There are some legitimate  
25 concerns. You know, community ID signs, way finders and all



1 that, that's an open debate. But there are tens of  
2 thousands of signs that are not compliant. Some of them are  
3 legitimate because they were posted 30 years ago. But some  
4 of them -- in one of them we saw the wording that was a word  
5 sign on a newly installed traffic signal.

6 But the question is that, should that even  
7 Caltrans look at becoming an enforcement agency for MUTCD?  
8 Because they are not. They just establish the guidelines  
9 and the standards. The same way that they do say for --  
10 well the highway design manual is a bit different legally.

11 So the question is do we think it's a good idea  
12 for Caltrans to consider becoming an enforcement agency for  
13 California MUTCD? Or do we want to even consider such a  
14 recommendation? Mr. Fisher.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Caltrans only has  
16 the authority that it is designated for. So I don't know  
17 that we have discovered anything here which gives Caltrans  
18 the authority to be the enforcement arm.

19 My recommendation would be to ask Caltrans to  
20 research if there are any models that have worked in the 49  
21 other states that we can draw from regarding enforcement of  
22 uniformity of traffic control devices. Maybe another state  
23 is doing something. And we might learn if that is working  
24 and if it could be maybe applied to California, whatever  
25 that may be. That's my primary concern or my primary

1 message that I want to get out.

2           The other thing I want to get out is I don't think  
3 this is under the jurisdiction of the Committee. While I  
4 deeply share the concerns brought up about the lack of  
5 uniformity, I don't believe that the Committee has any  
6 jurisdiction. Our jurisdiction is to promote uniformity and  
7 I don't know that we have any enforcement arm.

8           But I do have to comment on the way finding sign  
9 issue. Way finding signs has become just a more updated or  
10 trendy term for guide sign. A guide sign tells you what  
11 street to take to get where you need to go. And so we call  
12 it a way finding sign.

13           And my primary issue with the way finding signs is  
14 I understand the need for community expression and  
15 uniqueness. Every community in a continuing suburbia wants  
16 to be unique in some way. But I think what gets lost in the  
17 discussion is that we are talking about the motorist's  
18 ability to read a sign and know what to do.

19           And if the way finding signs come in tan and brown  
20 and purple and have a --

21           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Fuchsia, don't  
22 forget fuchsia.

23           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Fuchsia. And  
24 have an arrow that is non-standard or has a font that's got  
25 very blocky serifs to it or whatever it may be, the motorist

1 isn't going to read it.

2           Now when you present it on paper and you're  
3 standing still you'd say yeah, it looks good, I can read it.  
4 If you are a pedestrian walking down the street you can read  
5 it. But when you go through these airports and when you  
6 pass by some of these way finding signs at 40 miles an hour,  
7 35 miles an hour, you can't read them. And that's what is  
8 getting lost in all of this and that has been my experience.

9           You did mention the LA way finding signs. And we  
10 made sure, at great political capital, that they were green  
11 as a guide sign is and that they used standard letter styles  
12 and that the arrow was of a standard letter style.  
13 Hopefully so that they could be more readily identified and  
14 understood.

15           I think what we have seen here is the real problem  
16 is we are saying, uniformity, how do we enforce it. And  
17 then we are seeing instances of, well I don't really care  
18 what the uniform guidelines say, I want to do my own thing  
19 for community uniqueness.

20           And I think what the best strategy is, is to see  
21 what other states have done or to try to better communicate  
22 why uniformity is good for helping the motorist know where  
23 to go and how best to get there.

24           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: In my younger days I  
25 had an experience in the City of Orange. The City of Orange

1 for those of you who don't know is 26 square miles. It used  
2 to have 120,000 population. They have 73 churches. So I  
3 saw all these church signs on the streets. And as a traffic  
4 engineer I was young and naive. Sent my crew out there and  
5 said, they don't belong in right of way. The first church  
6 sign that I took off, the mayor used to go to that church.

7 (Laughter.)

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That was the end of  
9 it. We put it back, a better sign. So sometimes it's not  
10 as easy. Mr. Knowles.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The one thing I would  
12 ask in this discussion. For so many communities that put up  
13 these community banners like this. You know, the Shop Local  
14 campaign that was obviously going on in La Verne. These are  
15 considered something that is governed by the California  
16 Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. We would need  
17 some kind of little informational campaign from Caltrans to  
18 bring that to cities' attention.

19 Because we do community banners on streetlights  
20 all the time. And we do assess, you know, does it look like  
21 a traffic control device? Is it going to block? We're  
22 always looking at them from a liability standpoint. But it  
23 has never been an issue in any city I have ever worked in,  
24 can we do it or not. It's just been, what does the design  
25 look like, how are we funding it, who is it installing it,

1 who is taking it down. You know, the proper process. But  
2 we just did this all the time.

3 If in fact this is improper it would be the first  
4 time I remember hearing that it's improper to ever use one  
5 of these banners on an in-city right of way on something  
6 like a streetlight pole. So a little educational campaign  
7 also I think is necessary.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes. I had posed a  
9 question whether Caltrans should even consider being the  
10 enforcement agency for MUTCD but Mr. Fisher pushed it one  
11 more level. And he said, even if it is our jurisdiction to  
12 even make such a recommendation for Caltrans.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I agree.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: With which one?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes.

16 (Laughter.)

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So you're running  
18 for an office, huh? Okay.

19 Any other thoughts? If you guys don't think that  
20 this is even purview of this committee we are not even going  
21 to have a motion for a recommendation. But if you want  
22 Caltrans to at least research and investigate -- first of all  
23 if they have the legal right under the existing state  
24 statute, which I don't believe they do, to enforce MUTCD.  
25 But if they find out then how do they want to do it and do

1     they want to have a mechanism in place. But if you think it  
2     is none of our business we just move on and go to the next  
3     item.

4             COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I would move that  
5     we ask Caltrans to come back with a report on other ways  
6     that, ways that other states may enforce uniformity. So at  
7     least --

8             COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You understand it  
9     requires a lot of work. They have to contact 49 DOTs  
10    throughout the country.

11            COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Well then put it on  
12    the agenda.

13            COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, I mean, I  
14    know Johnny Buller is involved with the national committee  
15    on uniform traffic control devices and therefore has  
16    contacts. And maybe through that network we can find out if  
17    there are any known models that work. I am not sure that  
18    would -- I know it's a little bit of work but I think it  
19    would be helpful to at least know that.

20            COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: But then what?

21            COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It's an  
22    informational item.

23            COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes, but I mean, to  
24    me then what? Then is the state or county going to start --

25            COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Because suppose the

1 Department of Transportation in Montana does this. It  
2 doesn't mean California can do that. If you want to do  
3 research, I think even if you want to make any  
4 recommendation, which I am still questioning, the first  
5 thing is that if California even has jurisdiction under the  
6 existing state law to even do such a thing. Because it goes  
7 to the issue of sovereignty of cities and all that.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: You know, if there  
9 is going to be any research. I am not suggesting. But if  
10 Caltrans wishes to do any research the only research I see  
11 here is there are two sections or at least two  
12 presentations. There are people who complained, said here  
13 are all the sections of the Vehicle Code that says it's in  
14 violation of doing this. And then the cities have given us  
15 this other Vehicle Code section, 21351, that says local  
16 authorities have the right to do that.

17 so if there is going to be any legal analysis are  
18 they correct? Which one prevails? But that's about it. I  
19 really don't think state resources are -- But it's their  
20 call. So that's really the limit I would be even  
21 interested. Just knowing the --

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So are you sharing  
23 thoughts or making a motion?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, no motion, I'm  
25 not making any motion.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, you're just  
2 sharing thoughts, okay.

3 Ms. Wong? No? No comments.

4 Let's go to the Chief. Chief, you don't have any  
5 thoughts on this?

6 Mr. Knowles and Mr. Babico have shared some  
7 comments.

8 If I don't see a motion and a second that passes  
9 we have just shared our thoughts and views with you, you can  
10 do with it whatever you wish. Except if somebody wishes to  
11 make a motion.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Let me ask.  
13 Wayne, Caltrans put this on the agenda. How did Caltrans --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: We just wanted a  
15 discussion.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And I can see that  
18 there's really as big a problem as some people would let on.  
19 And if they are not a big problem for mainly the cities and  
20 counties, because that's where most of them are, I'm not  
21 going to worry about it, to be honest with you.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Nobody wants to make  
23 a motion on this? Okay, the Committee doesn't take any  
24 action on this. But it doesn't diminish the contributions  
25 of Mr. Lengel and Mr. Shanteau and the fact that we have a



1 problem. It's just a question of how you can best handle it  
2 legally. Thank you.

3 Moving on to the next item. That is also another  
4 kind of unique one. It's Item -- okay, let me see, let me  
5 find my --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: 09-16.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: 09-16 is signage,  
8 intersection design and three second minimum yellow for  
9 turning movement. Mr. Henley.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay, this is a  
11 situation where, you know, when you put in the red light  
12 running cameras, you know, depending on the yellow cycle,  
13 you can wind up with a lot more tickets. Mr. Lissner is  
14 going to give us a presentation on this subject. He has  
15 noticed some really egregious situations in some parts of  
16 the state.

17 MR. LISSNER: Jim Lissner, Hermosa Beach.

18 In the material in the agenda I have a picture of  
19 an intersection in Commerce. It's part of a large complex  
20 of unusual intersections. Part of it is called the mix-  
21 master because it's got three streets coming together all in  
22 one intersection. Very unusual. Kind of confusing.

23 In this intersection in Commerce, which has a  
24 three second yellow for the left turn, the number of  
25 violations over the period of time that the camera has been

1 operating has not gone down. You can see that in Table 1  
2 split between pages 44 and 45 in the agenda materials.

3           However, after I wrote to the City of Commerce and  
4 asked for the table of their, asked for the signal timing  
5 chart for the signal, about a week later they did increase  
6 the length of the yellow from three seconds up to four. And  
7 now the number of violations probably will go down. You can  
8 see the signal timing charts in pages one and two of the  
9 supplement materials that I gave to you.

10           Also in the supplement that I gave to you pages  
11 three through five. There's a picture of an intersection in  
12 Menlo Park. It's where you come off the bridge coming over  
13 from the East Bay. It's a very high speed street. I  
14 believe it's 50 miles per hour. It has a left turn pocket  
15 that's around 1100 feet long. A double left turn.  
16 Tremendous demand for left turns. And the speeds in the  
17 left turn pocket as measured by the red light camera there  
18 are around 35 miles per hour. And the red light camera is  
19 measuring the speed just before the limit line. So people  
20 are really moving around that corner. Again it's got a  
21 three second yellow and it's got a lot of tickets.

22           It should be a four second yellow because of the  
23 speeds. Basically if you are doing 35 it's kind of  
24 dangerous to try to stop quickly enough to comply with a  
25 three second yellow, especially when there is this intense

1 pressure from 1100 feet of cars behind you wanting to go  
2 around the corner.

3           If they increase that to four seconds that would  
4 reduce the number of violations about two-thirds. I have a  
5 chart about that in supplement six of what I gave you.  
6 There's also extra copies of supplement six on the back  
7 table. It's a chart from Mesa, Arizona where they increased  
8 the yellows from three seconds up to four. And they saw a  
9 two-thirds decrease in the number of violations by the next  
10 month. And that happened in the year 2000 so we have data  
11 since then to show us that there wasn't a rebound.

12           People didn't figure out -- Well if they did  
13 figure out that the yellow was longer they didn't take  
14 advantage of it. They basically -- it showed us that if you  
15 give people a long enough yellow they are going to obey the  
16 signal much better. The converse of that of course is if  
17 you took the yellow and decreased it from four seconds down  
18 to three you would triple the number of violations, which is  
19 pretty bad.

20           So these examples like the Commerce intersection  
21 and the one in Menlo Park argue that three seconds probably  
22 should be the exception for left turns. That if the city  
23 wants to put the yellow for left turns at three seconds that  
24 there should be -- it should need an engineering report or  
25 some kind of justification for needing to be that long. And

1 that in all other cases the goal of reducing the number of  
2 violations should be paramount and the yellow should be four  
3 seconds because we want to reduce the number of violations.  
4 So four seconds should be the rule on that.

5           In the agenda materials that I submitted, Part 1B  
6 of my discussion was about oddball intersections. It was  
7 the one up in Rocklin. I used the one up in Rocklin as an  
8 example because people were telling me about how they had  
9 unintentionally run by the limit line there, basically.  
10 They came out from underneath a dark underpass to a  
11 intersection where the layout is kind of strange. Where the  
12 limit line -- where you hit the limit line before you expect  
13 to because the place where you turn is far off in the  
14 distance. The crosswalk is just all -- it's not a  
15 conventional layout. So these people were describing a  
16 situation where they would come out there, they would  
17 recognize the limit line too late and end up stopping 20, 30  
18 feet beyond it. And then they'd back up. But of course  
19 they'd have this ticket.

20           That one is also interesting. This is in Table 3  
21 in the agenda materials, which is on page 46. The number of  
22 violations was not going down. In fact, over time it was  
23 going up. So this argues that on these oddball  
24 intersections there needs to be some kind of engineering  
25 study and a later review to make sure that violations go

1 down. Because the whole goal here is to be safer. I mean,  
2 that's the whole reason for the traffic engineering  
3 industry. Otherwise do what you want.

4           Anyway, the last part of my materials was back in  
5 Commerce again. And this is one that I just came across by  
6 chance when I was looking at the Commerce materials. I  
7 noticed that they had a lot of tickets from a right turn on  
8 red. And this is in Table 2 of my materials, which is on  
9 page 48 in the agenda.

10           This was another situation where the number of  
11 tickets was not going down over time. Again you wonder, you  
12 know, people are getting beat over the head with these  
13 tickets. Why is the number of violations not going down.  
14 And my rationale -- I mean my -- I figure that the reason it  
15 is not going down is that it is not realistic to expect  
16 compliance with kind of an uncommon sign which is dependant  
17 upon reading English. They have a sign, they are using  
18 signs that say "no turn on red."

19           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Lissner, will  
20 you summarize, please.

21           MR. LISSNER: Yes, I'm about 30 seconds away from  
22 being done.

23           And they don't say that, they don't say no turn on  
24 red symbolically, they say "no turn on red." It might as  
25 well be in French because, I mean, a lot of the people there

1 are first language is some other language or maybe they  
2 don't read all that well at all. We have a lot of native  
3 Californians that don't read all that well at all.

4           So if it's really -- if it's so important for  
5 people not to make the right turn on red that you put a  
6 camera there to enforce it, then it should also be important  
7 enough to put up some kind of sign that displays the  
8 international symbol for no turn during the time when you  
9 are not supposed to make the turn. Otherwise the number of  
10 violations won't go down and you haven't served the safety  
11 goal that you were trying to reach.

12           Anyway, thank you very much.

13           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you very much.  
14 Thank you for bringing it to our attention. I for one  
15 completely agree with your point. It's something that when  
16 we looked at the yellow timing for red light cameras, which  
17 ended up being the yellow timing for all traffic signals.  
18 We said we were going to come back and fix and we didn't. I  
19 checked the minutes. And also it says in the manual that  
20 the Committee will reevaluate the minimum yellow timing for  
21 left turns. Thank you for bringing it to our attention.

22           MR. LISSNER: Thank you.

23           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And we were  
24 concerned about exactly the same situations that you have  
25 investigated. The continuous and now urban diamonds and

1 long turn pockets. Okay, Jim, thank you. Before you go let  
2 me see if any of the members have any questions.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Mr. Chairman.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes sir.

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We did open this item  
6 up for one year. There were no comments from the Committee  
7 or from the public so we closed it out.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, we'll open it  
9 again. Maybe. Mr. Lissner sat down but I can ask him to  
10 come back if you have questions of him. But I think he has  
11 made his point very eloquently with very good documentation.  
12 So where do you want to go with this?

13 Before I even ask you this, is there anybody else  
14 in the public? I can give you only 30 seconds, okay.  
15 That's it and I mean it. Because I am running against time  
16 and 30 seconds. Don't rehash what Mr. Lissner said already,  
17 we know we have a problem.

18 DR. SHANTEAU: Because I'm a bicycling advocate I  
19 see a lot of photographs from Europe. One of the points  
20 that they make is that they use near side signals only.  
21 They don't use the far side signals like we do. They don't  
22 use a cone of vision like we do, number one. So maybe it  
23 would be worth experimenting with some near side signals in  
24 California.

25 Two, is on the four second yellow business. Gee,

1 now I have to criticize myself. I wrote a paper when I was  
2 at Purdue. This would be 1983, '84, that said exactly that.  
3 That to give a reasonable driver the opportunity to stop or  
4 go and not enter on red you need four seconds, not three.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, so you are  
6 accepting that we have a problem that needs to be addressed.

7 DR. SHANTEAU: So what I am suggesting is that you  
8 might want to ask Caltrans to do a study on -- to come back  
9 to you with a recommendation on those two points.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Chad.

11 MR. DORNSIFE: Yes. the 1988 MUTCD 4B-20, which  
12 was signal timing, required that the signal timing meet the  
13 needs of traffic. That's all it said. And you had to do  
14 periodic engineering reviews to make sure that it was  
15 compliant.

16 Then you had situations like San Diego by the  
17 airport. They were writing north of 3,000 tickets a month  
18 at an intersection that didn't have a single accident two  
19 years prior to the camera going in and hadn't had an  
20 accident since.

21 We changed the signal timing from three seconds to  
22 four and a half seconds. The number of citations went down  
23 to 200 and some from 3,000, north of 3,000. The city didn't  
24 like that so they reduced it to four seconds, now it's back  
25 up to 800 or 900.



1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

2 Marty.

3 MR. AMUNDSON: Hi, Marty Amundson from LA County.

4 I just wanted to let you know that we felt that  
5 the current standard as its written seems to be fine. I  
6 mean, I think people forget about the last part, there is an  
7 option that states that the minimum yellow interval for a  
8 through moving and the protected left turns and right turns  
9 may be increased based on a field review and by using  
10 appropriate judgment. And that includes, the judgment can  
11 include the 85th percentile, intersection geometry and field  
12 observations. So I don't think -- everybody just focuses on  
13 the first paragraph and they forget about the second  
14 paragraph. That based on engineering judgment you can  
15 increase that.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: But you agree that  
17 the local jurisdiction that has a vested interest to  
18 increase the number of tickets is going to stay with the  
19 minimum.

20 MR. AMUNDSON: Well, they should be looking at it.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, but --

22 MR. AMUNDSON: Eventually they are supposed to be  
23 trying to reduce -- And so yellows, you know. If they see  
24 there's nothing they should be reevaluating it and seeing  
25 what should be done.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Can I ask a  
3 question?

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: One of the  
6 intersections mentioned I think was Eastern and Atlantic.

7 MR. AMUNDSON: Yes.

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The mix-master.  
9 Does the County operate that signal?

10 MR. AMUNDSON: No, it was Eastern at Telegraph. I  
11 mean Atlantic and Telegraph they're talking about. We don't  
12 maintain the intersection, it is the City of Commerce. But  
13 the City of Commerce had issued us a service request to look  
14 at the intersection to evaluate the yellows for them.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And as a result  
16 of that reevaluation what occurred?

17 MR. AMUNDSON: We recommended to them that it be  
18 increased to four seconds.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And it was  
20 increased to four seconds?

21 MR. AMUNDSON: Yes.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The matter was  
23 taken care of.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No, but tens of  
25 thousands of people got tickets before it was increased.

1 And the same situation I'm sure is prevailing all over the  
2 state. Thank you.

3 DEPUTY KEY: My name is Joseph Key, deputy with LA  
4 County Sheriff. I administer the City of Commerce's red  
5 light camera system. And I think everybody here is missing  
6 the point, especially Mr. Lissner when he says the purpose  
7 of red light cameras is to reduce tickets. It is not, it is  
8 to reduce accidents and be safe.

9 We have reduced accidents in that intersection.  
10 If you look at that intersection, it's a terrible  
11 intersection. I am not an engineer, almost everybody else  
12 in here is, and I say that's a terrible intersection.

13 We have a lot of commuter traffic going through  
14 that intersection. It's only three ways into that city down  
15 the 5 corridor. People jump off the freeway when the 5 is  
16 shut down due to going home traffic. And I know everybody  
17 that goes home from here is in traffic. They jump off the  
18 freeway and they shoot down Telegraph to try to avoid it.  
19 Okay, that's why we have all this traffic going through that  
20 one little intersection. There are only three ways in.  
21 This is the main artery into the City of Commerce and down  
22 the 5.

23 I am not going to spend a lot of time. I don't  
24 have it. But the chart that Mr. Lissner was talking about,  
25 the right hand don't turn on red. We don't even enforce no

1 turn on reds, so that's a moot point. As the chief will  
2 probably tell you, that is a 21453(b), which is not a red  
3 light camera violation. You can only do A and C in the  
4 state of California. So I don't even know why that was even  
5 brought up.

6 Plus his chart that he was using is actually --  
7 the eastbound and westbound traffic is reversed. We don't  
8 have all that traffic going eastbound in violation, it's all  
9 going westbound. And the people I talk to every day, I say,  
10 well why did you run the red light going westbound. Well I  
11 saw people making a left turn in front of me. I figured I  
12 didn't have to stop because I knew nobody else was coming.  
13 They're making a left turn in front of me. I can make a  
14 right turn, I don't have to stop. The law says you have to  
15 stop before you make that right turn.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Now I  
17 think the issue that was presented is an example. I don't  
18 think anybody wants to pick on a specific city or a specific  
19 intersection. The question is that, is there a need to  
20 revisit that left turn minimum three second.  
21 Mr. Mansourian.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: You know, I remember  
23 we debated for hours about having the minimum three seconds.  
24 And there were specifically concerns by Committee Members  
25 that if we go with a minimum many people will use the

1 minimum and will not go to the next paragraph that says, but  
2 you can go more if you look into it.

3 And we had a debate, remember. We said, then go  
4 four. And then somebody said, why not five, why not six,  
5 you know, and so on. I don't know if there is an abuse  
6 here. I don't believe there is one here. But if it's a  
7 difficult intersection we have gone out of our way, tried to  
8 leave it up to the individual local traffic engineer as  
9 opposed to we tried to dictate from the state level what  
10 every intersection should be handled.

11 You know, Mr. Chairman, I think if you want to  
12 bring it back and look at it again, fine, but I think we are  
13 going to have the same debate. You see what I'm saying?  
14 That, you know, some people will use the minimum and not use  
15 engineering judgment. But unless we are willing to micro-  
16 manage it I don't know what else we can do.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm pleased to  
19 see that in this case, at least in the one intersection I  
20 inquired about, the system worked. Someone noticed that it  
21 was too low for the geometrics, called the local agency.  
22 The local agency looked into it and decided that it wasn't a  
23 conventional left turn and changed the time accordingly. So  
24 that worked.

25 I remember when we discussed the minimum yellow

1 time for a left turn phase. We said it would be three  
2 seconds. The minimum yellow for a through movement at 25  
3 miles an hour is three seconds. So we thought there was  
4 plenty of slack in there and that most left turns are made  
5 under 25 miles an hour.

6 Most left turns at a conventional intersection are  
7 made under a 50 foot turning radius, a 70 foot turning  
8 radius. So maybe if you've got a large intersection a 150  
9 foot turning radius. A 200 foot radius would correspond  
10 with a 25 mile an hour speed. And it's a rare, rare  
11 intersection that has a turning radius of 200 feet. And in  
12 the case here where there was a turning radius of something  
13 that looks close to 200 feet the agency corrected it.

14 I'm not sure if we have a widespread problem here  
15 that isn't already addressed through the language that we  
16 have in the manual. But I am willing to hear what the  
17 others think. I think with the very nice job that  
18 Mr. Lissner has done with identifying, you know, ways that  
19 you would qualify the 3.0 seconds. I think that's a nice  
20 list. I think we can simplify it. But I want to hear from  
21 the others if they really think there's a problem with the  
22 language that we have. And keep in mind, most left turns  
23 are made with the radius under 200 feet, which corresponds  
24 to a speed of 25 miles an hour.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Let's see if anyone

1 on this side of the table has any comments. Mr. Babico?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Chief?

6 The question is not the turn radius at the  
7 intersection. The question is the approach speed as the  
8 driver is approaching the intersection when he is in the  
9 dilemma zone. That's when the yellow kicks in. And the  
10 cases that Mr. Lissner has identified, some of them such as  
11 the intersections that have a smaller than 70 degree turn  
12 radii approach, or the intersections that have very long  
13 turn pockets.

14 These days it is very common in a lot of areas  
15 where you have two, three left turn pockets in excess of 700  
16 feet. When people enter the left turn pocket they do not  
17 proceed at 25 miles per hour. They are proceeding at the  
18 prevailing through traffic pretty much. So if the through  
19 traffic is going at 50, the person who is in the left turn  
20 pocket that is 700 feet long, he is pretty much going at 40,  
21 45. And at 40, 45 a three second minimum yellow is not  
22 enough. They will brake when they get close to the  
23 intersection. But the idea --

24 That's why I'm saying that I have seen it, that it  
25 creates trap conditions. And if there is not a red light

1 camera at the intersection I'm fine with that. It's not  
2 good traffic engineering practice. But when there is a red  
3 light camera in place then it creates a lot of potential for  
4 abuse and tickets where the tickets are not really, may not  
5 be warranted.

6 Chief.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: This comes back to what  
8 the deputy from LA County was saying. That, you know, the  
9 whole purpose of red light cameras is supposed to be  
10 improving traffic safety. It is not supposed to have  
11 anything to do with the number of violations that aren't  
12 causing accidents. It's to stop accidents.

13 As you are describing the longer left turn pockets  
14 and the approach speed and everything else I can't help to  
15 going back to this whole discussion on the setting of speed  
16 limits. So if as part of those previous discussions, yellow  
17 light timing was part of those discussions. If yellow light  
18 timing is being based on the posted speed limit, which is  
19 not a reflection of what the actual speed is, then you are  
20 going to have a problem. But if you are conducting your  
21 traffic surveys and your speed limits are set appropriately,  
22 would that not increase your yellow light timing anyway  
23 where this minimum --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: For through  
25 movement, for through movement.



1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: But you just said they  
2 were approaching at speeds close to through movement.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, yes. But the  
4 through movement, suppose we have a protected left turn and  
5 we have a through movement. The driver is approaching at  
6 45, 50 miles per hour. The driver that wants to go through  
7 gets like 4.3 seconds yellow. The driver who wants to make  
8 a left gets into a very long left turn pocket, 600, 700  
9 feet. And he is getting only three seconds. Which gives  
10 him adequate time in the dilemma zone for 25 miles per hour.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: That's what I'm saying.  
12 If the vehicles are actually traveling at a faster speed  
13 than you are assuming they are traveling because they have  
14 got such a long approach pocket, then the yellow light does  
15 need to be increased.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's my point.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: The timing does need to  
18 be increased.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That maybe the three  
20 second minimum is not really --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Well I think it comes  
22 down to this is a minimum, this is not the cutoff. This is  
23 a minimum. This is a starting point. And then you have to  
24 look at what your traffic is actually doing, right?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And they do that.

1 To their credit, all the local agencies do that when there  
2 is simply the issue of traffic safety. Unfortunately if  
3 there is a red light camera there is the potential to go to  
4 the minimum to have more tickets. That's just a fact of  
5 life.

6 Okay, but we have heard from everybody, I think.  
7 Anybody else want to talk about -- Do you want to -- Okay,  
8 what is your pleasure?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Well this was an  
10 informational item. Unless somebody wants to bring it back  
11 as an action item, we heard it.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Ms. Wong?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: No.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No. Mr. Fisher?

15 Okay, that's it. We heard, thank you.

16 I think on the --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I've got to go,  
18 sorry.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Before you go, the  
20 next meeting.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Next meeting.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The next meeting we  
23 either need to go back to Bay Area or San Diego. We haven't  
24 been in those areas in a while. What's your pleasure, do  
25 you prefer San Diego or Bay Area or San Jose?

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Northern California.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Northern California.

3 San Jose or San Francisco?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Either way.

5 (Several people spoke at once about

6 coordinating the next meeting.)

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Devinder and I,

8 we'll coordinate. Well let's pick the date first.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, pick the date.

10 It's probably going to be what, August?

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: September.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You want to go

13 September instead of August?

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Let's do September.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: After Labor Day.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The 17th is a

17 Thursday.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thursday.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Does that work for

20 everybody?

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It's too far out,

22 you can clear it. Except if someone has a standing board

23 meeting or something.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: September 17?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, the next

1 meeting is September 17, location, Northern California,  
2 exact location to be determined later based on the  
3 availability of rooms.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I was going to suggest,  
5 you know we are coming out with essentially a new MUTCD in  
6 December. Do you guys want to spend a day in a workshop  
7 going over all the --

8 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We were going to  
9 discuss it in the next item.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: That's what I mean. I  
11 was hoping -- I was afraid they were leaving.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. No, no,  
13 that's good actually you brought it up.

14 Okay, on Item 09-17 that's -- is that information?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes, 09-17, information.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So before you go,  
17 there may be a need for a full day workshop. And we will  
18 work with the schedule.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Will you e-mail it?  
20 Is that what you want to do?

21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: E-mail, pick two  
23 days.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: The workshop is going  
25 to be before the actual CTCDC meeting.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Separate, not back-  
2 to-back.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, 30 days before  
4 the meeting. Because we are going to put that item on the  
5 agenda.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I see.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So sometime mid-  
8 August.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: A workshop for  
10 what?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: The changes to the MUTCD  
12 that we are proposing. We've got a whole bunch of changes.

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: The next item,  
14 California MUTCD Revision. Again this is Devinder Singh,  
15 Secretary of the CTCDC.

16 We want to ask the Committee if they would like to have  
17 a workshop to review draft Revision of 2. It's very minimal. We  
18 discussed during the September 17, 2008 meeting. And that's  
19 the only revision that is proposed by the FHWA.

20 But at the same time we are going to include all  
21 the pending items that CTCDC has recommended. They are listed  
22 on page 4 of 53 of the agenda.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Which page?

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Page 4 of 53. We will  
25 include all these items in the California MUTCD update.

1           If the Committee wants a workshop or we need a  
2 workshop it would be at least 40 days before the September meeting so that  
3 we can place this item on the agenda to satisfy the legal  
4 requirement of 30 days before the meeting.

5           I believe there is no need for the workshop. We  
6 can communicate the draft through e-mail with the Committee  
7 Members. If you believe you need a workshop we can have a  
8 workshop.

9           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just one thing. You  
10 know, this is a very long list. If this gets on the agenda  
11 without having filtered and discussed before we are going to  
12 have like a 12 hour meeting just to go through this.  
13 Everybody is going to start again picking points and  
14 changing words and diagrams. So if you want to put all  
15 these items on the same agenda I suggest we run it through a  
16 workshop first.

17           COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: These items are  
18 already recommended by the Committee and there are already  
19 policies proposed by the Committee. So let's say if we adopt  
20 these items now we are not going to bring to the Committee,  
21 this is going to be adopted through TOPD process. So instead of  
22 issuing an TOPD for each item we planned to include all items in the  
23 California MUTCD update.

24           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

25           COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So the work already

1 has been done on these items.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: So why are you bringing  
3 it to the next meeting? These are approved by CTCDC.

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Instead of  
5 doing it through the TOPD we are going to include in the  
6 California MUTCD update, yes.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right, correct. How  
8 about these, the one -- are you going to discuss it with the  
9 Committee?

10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No, not those items  
11 you are talking about. These items are already  
12 recommended by the Committee and we plan to include in the  
13 California MUTCD update instead of doing a separate TOPD.  
14 But the main inclusion is Revision 2 of MUTCD. That's the reason  
15 we are updating the California MUTCD. Because it's required before  
16 December 2009.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But Devinder, in the  
18 past we discussed there were so many mistakes and errors on  
19 the existing California MUTCD. And you and Johnny  
20 recommended that when we updated those the CA MUTCD would  
21 bring those corrections into discussion.

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Johnny already have a  
23 list of those corrections.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. That's what we  
25 are asking. If you want a workshop, fine. The workshop

1 needs to be 40 days before the next meeting.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, you know what,  
3 let's go schedule the workshop.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Whoever is available  
6 shows up. Send a request for availability, see who is  
7 available and then set up a workshop in Sacramento. Whoever  
8 is available is going to show up.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So we would have a  
10 workshop in the first week of August.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, there you go.

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: In Sacramento.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do we need to  
14 have a workshop?

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: That's what I'm  
16 asking, do we need to have a workshop?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I think it's better  
18 to schedule one. Send us, send us the report so we know how  
19 much it is. And if people don't want to comment and say we  
20 don't need it then we don't need it.

21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Fine. We will share  
22 the draft through e-mail too.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Exactly. Because we  
24 don't know, we don't know how heavy it is until we see the  
25 draft.



1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: The magnitude, right,  
2 yes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So let's see the  
4 draft and then we decide.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Any other  
7 item that's left on the agenda?

8 Chief, yes.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Is it possible to move  
10 the next meeting back one week to the 24th?

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Is it possible to do  
13 that? I'm supposed to be out of state.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: What date do you  
15 have in mind?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: What?

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: What date do you  
18 have in mind?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Just the next week, the  
20 24th, September 24th.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Move it back.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Is that okay?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So we move it to  
24 September 24th. The location is still to be determined,  
25 somewhere in Northern California.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Then we have one more  
2 item on the agenda, the American Recovery and Reinvestment  
3 Act Project Funding Signs.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I've got to go catch  
5 a taxi.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay, go ahead.

7 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Devinder, we'll cut out this  
8 PowerPoint. We don't need the PowerPoint.

9 Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans Office of Signs and  
10 Markings. I placed by your name sign there a handout that  
11 gives you explanation of what these signs are all about. I  
12 think you have heard about the Recovery Act.

13 Look at the very last page of the handout. It's  
14 colored. A colored sheet that looks like this. This is,  
15 this is the gist of what we are going to be talking about.  
16 Everybody's got that in their hand? There's a large picture  
17 in the agenda but I passed out a second. Mr. Fisher, by  
18 your name tag at the top of your desk there. Yes.

19 Just look on -- the very last page has the  
20 different versions of this sign. It's gone through a lot of  
21 evolution in the short time it's been living. The main gist  
22 here is President Obama has asked us to put out the word to  
23 strongly encourage -- it's not a requirement but strongly  
24 encourage that this sign be used at any project that is  
25 using funds from the Recovery Act.

1           So the sheet here shows you the various versions.  
2   Larger signs for freeways, smaller signs for conventional  
3   highways. The main difference being the pictographs on the  
4   bottom. And the standard pictograph for the Recovery Act is  
5   the round one with the flowers and leaves on it. And then  
6   depending on which agency is sponsoring or developing the  
7   project we'll put their pictographs on the bottom.

8           So the question of the day is, what does the TIGER  
9   stand for? Anyone know? I'll tell you. Transportation  
10   Investment Generating Economic Recovery. That's the US DOT  
11   TIGER Team. That's why it has orange and black stripes on  
12   it. That was given to us and that's what we'll be using.  
13   But that's what TIGER is. So if anyone wants to ask you  
14   what TIGER is you now know.

15           Any questions, you can direct those to Don Howe.  
16   His name and e-mail is on the bottom of that cover sheet.  
17   And this not being incorporated into the manual because it  
18   is temporary in nature. In your agenda it is set up with  
19   the manual language standard and guidance. But keep in mind  
20   it's temporary so it's not going into the manual.

21           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So if a county has a  
22   project that uses ARRA money, if they want to use a sign  
23   this is the sign they must use.

24           MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

25           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: But they don't have

1 to use the sign.

2 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Correct. If they use a sign it  
3 must be this sign but it is not mandatory that they use it.

4 Any questions? Thank you.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No questions?

6 Mr. Fisher.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Shouldn't it say  
8 that the sign is optional?

9 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Pardon me?

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Shouldn't this  
11 language say that the sign is optional?

12 MS. McLAUGHLIN: In the top part it talks, the  
13 word is "strongly encouraged."

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

15 MS. McLAUGHLIN: It says, in no case -- support.  
16 The last sentence after California Department of  
17 Transportation. "Caltrans strongly encourage agencies in  
18 California to use this sign." That's the wording that we  
19 were asked to use.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And if you don't you  
21 are going to be audited by the IRS.

22 MS. McLAUGHLIN: So it's not a shall or should.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: You won't have to worry  
24 about it for the second project.

25 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes, right, exactly.

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Is there a .pdf  
2 of this on-line for the TIGER layout and the circular  
3 layout?

4 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes, yes it is. It will be on-  
5 line very soon if not today.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay, great.

7 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. And there is a full-blown  
8 probably 20 page that has that layout in it as well. Okay?

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other questions  
10 for Roberta? Thank you very much.

11 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Do we have any other  
13 items, Mr. Henley or we are done?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, I think we are done.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We are done. Next  
16 meeting, September 24th. And we may have a workshop in the  
17 first week of August, depending. And Mr. Singh is going to  
18 coordinate the workshop if needed.

19 Thank you all.

20 (Thereupon, the meeting of the California  
21 Traffic Control Devices Committee was  
22 adjourned at 2:55 p.m.)

23 --oOo--

24

25

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Troy Ray, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Department of Transportation, California Traffic Control Devices Committee meeting; that it was thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting, nor in any way interested in the outcome of said matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 5th day of June, 2009.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

□